41.

803.

SCRIPTURE

SUFFICIENT WITHOUT TRADITION,

OR

THE DOCTRINE OF THE SIXTH ARTICLE OF THE BRITISH CHURCHES MAINTAINED.

AN ESSAY WHICH OBTAINED THE NORRISIAN GOLD MEDAL FOR THE YEAR 1840, IN THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

BY THE

REV. DANIEL AUGUSTUS BEAUFORT, M.A.,

OF JESUS COLLEGE,
AND
ASSISTANT MINISTER OF PORTMAN CHAPEL, ST MARYLEBONE.

In Scripturis namque divinis quicquid salutaris requirit scientia, copiosissime reperitur expressum; ut quod ibi non inveneris, minime ad salutem sit necessarium.
TRITHEMIUS, *de lectione et studiis div. Script.* Homil. IV. A. D. 1486.

CAMBRIDGE:
PRINTED AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS,
PUBLISHED BY J. & J. J. DEIGHTON, CAMBRIDGE,
AND
J. W. PARKER, WEST STRAND; AND W. J. CLEAVER, BAKER STREET, LONDON.

M.DCCC.XLI.

A SYNOPSIS OF THE CONTENTS.

INTRODUCTION.

CHAPTER I.

CHAPTER II.

CHAPTER III.

CHAPTER IV.

CONCLUSION.

EXTANT hodie sacræ Literæ, extant scripta Apostolorum et Prophetarum, ex quibus et omnis veritas et doctrina Catholica probari possit, et omnis hæresis refutari.

Recipimus et amplectimur omnes Canonicas Scripturas et Veteris et Novi Testamenti..... In illis solis posse hominum animos acquiescere; in illis ea omnia quæcunque ad nostram salutem sint necessaria.....cumulate et plene contineri; eas esse vim et potentiam Dei ad salutem; eas esse fundamenta Prophetarum et Apostolorum, in quibus ædificata sit Ecclesia Dei; eas esse certissimam normam ad quam ea—si vacillet aut erret—possit exigi, et ad quam omnis doctrina ecclesiastica debeat revocari; contra eas nec legem, nec traditionem, nec consuetudinem ullam audiendam esse; ne si Paulus quidem ipse aut Angelus de cœlo veniat, et secus doceat.

JEWELLI, *Episc. Sarisbur. Apologia.*

INTRODUCTION.

LET us suppose, that by any fortuitous concurrence of events some individual had arrived at manhood, without having ever seen the Bible, or having received any instruction in the doctrines of Revelation. Let us suppose further, that he was a man of sound sense, of a thoughtful turn of mind, and versed in the writings of the ancient Heathen. The religious knowledge, possessed by such an individual, would extend only so far as the "candle of the Lord[1]" within him had, by its constant but feeble ray, guided him to attain:—so far, in short, as to shew him that there must be a great First Cause, eternal and omnipotent and omniscient;—that, as no matter could be self-existent, so all creation must be the work of one and the same Creator[2]:—he would see that this moral

[1] Prov. xx. 27.

[2] Rom. i. 19, 20. The unity of the Godhead is shewn by the harmony observable in the varied works of creation. It is not said, that any such man ever *did* exist, only that such an one *might* have existed; and be it remembered, we are supposing one who had made the very best use of his natural powers of observation and reflexion.

Governor must have ordained certain laws by which his subjects were to be guided, and that therefore actions are to be distinguished as good and bad;—he would further perceive that besides the outward body which meets the eye and which is daily perishing around us, there likewise exists a something within—a power capable of distinguishing between good and evil[1], and of rendering its possessor happy or miserable; a something, too, which it is probable will continue to exist after the outward frame has perished[2]; and that consequently, a future state of being awaits us, in which—whether immediately upon our passage out of this life, or subsequently to other states of life and being[3]—a dispensation of rewards and punishments will ensue, to be administered according as we have here obeyed or transgressed the "law written in our hearts." Thus far the light within has guided its possessor; but here it stops,—further than this it is unable to pierce the gloom, and now all becomes uncertain, perplexing and confused. Evil and misery are prevalent around; but what is their origin? wherefore are they allowed? His conscience speaks of innumerable offences against the Divine precepts,

---

[1] Rom. ii. 15.

[2] See Butler's Analogy, Part I. Chap. i.

[3] Idem, Part I. Chap. ii. note *sub fin.* Also H. Horne's Introduction to the Scriptures, Vol. I. Ch. i.

and the consequent displeasure of God; guilt and the loss of Divine favor are present to his mind; but how to obtain reconciliation—by what means to procure reinstatement in the character and privileges of a faithful subject, he knows not. To be thus reconciled and reinstated, he must be pardoned; and pardon is an act of mere mercy; but of the mercy of God there are no proofs in his providence; the wound is felt, but for the remedy he is at a loss. And this ignorance produces misery and despair.

At this juncture suppose a friend to advance; and having learnt the object of his enquiry and cause of his despair, suppose him to begin to preach "the mystery of godliness—God manifest in the flesh;" to unfold that wondrous combination of awful justice and ineffable mercy, whereby sin is punished but the sinner spared;—to tell of the soul rendered foul and powerless by sin, and needing renovation by the operation of the Holy Ghost;—of the Church which the Saviour instituted to convey the supernatural means of grace to all whom He has "called out of darkness into his marvellous light[4];"—and, in short, to proclaim the fruitful faith and holy life and all the various requirements demanded of those who would enjoy the free but covenanted mercy of the Father, and

[4] 1 Pet. ii. 9.

would partake of that redemption wrought for all but to be obtained by few[1]. Suppose him to conclude by producing the Book of the New Covenant; and finally to satisfy the enquirer, that these are the genuine and authentic records of the life and teaching of the Christ and his chosen Apostles, and were really written by men under the plenary inspiration of the Holy Ghost.

With what transport would our imaginary child of nature seize upon the proffered book! How eagerly would he embrace, and implicitly rely on, a treasure so invaluable, affording a resolution to his doubts and "an anchor for his soul both sure and steadfast;" and—like the eunuch of old—"go on his way rejoicing," that now he might "come boldly to the throne of grace," for he had found that which was "able to make him wise unto salvation, through faith that is in Christ Jesus." But would not his joy be changed to grief, and certainty once more give place to doubt, were some one now to inform him that this valued record, though confessedly the gift of God, was unequal of itself to procure the end desired; for that certain necessary articles of belief and discipline were omitted, and that for them he must rely upon the oral teaching of the present Church, or rather upon the dictum of the present

[1] 2 Cor. v. 15. Matt. xx. 16. Heb. ii. 9.

supreme bishop of the Church? Would not, I say, such an assertion be received suspiciously and with hesitation;—with as much hesitation as the written record was at first, till satisfied that it was genuine? Would not the natural reply be, "It may be so; but before I assent to such a vital proposition, you must prove to me by intelligible evidence that it is as you affirm?" And in default of this, would he not naturally and justly refuse to receive so untangible and improbable a rule of faith?

Now this is just our real case. We have been brought to a knowledge of "the truth as it is in Jesus" by a kind and tender friend—the Church, into whose communion we have been baptized; she has presented us, through the agency of some who had been "called[2]" before us, with copies of the blessed volume containing God's revealed will. On the faith of our friend we receive it as such; we search its contents, and we discover frequent mention of God's having vouchsafed to inspire chosen men to commit to writing certain records of his will; hence we know that this *may* be such as it has been represented: presently we are satisfied on examination, of the authenticity and genuineness of the various portions of the work; and, finally, the inspiration of each author being

---

[2] Ἐκκλησία—ἐκκαλεῖν.

proved to us, we receive on conviction the whole volume as the inspired record of God's word. And thus far all believers join with us. But if we now advance a step, and assert the perfection of Holy Writ and its sufficiency to determine all Christian doctrine, we are met by several parties; the chief, and at the present day most formidable, of which is[1]—the Church of Rome.

The Church of Rome (or, at least, the bulk of the divines in her obedience) teaches that certain articles of belief and practice, necessary for the salvation of men through Jesus Christ, are not contained in that written word, which we all acknowledge to be the divinely inspired record of God's will; but have been preserved in tradition, and must be sought in the oral teaching of the present Church,—which teaching of the Church, in

---

[1] Amongst these no inconsiderable portion consists of the German Rationalists, and some others who *call* themselves Christians; but the following pages are dedicated solely to the consideration of this branch of the *Romish* Controversy, partly for the reason given in the text, partly because the terms of the Thesis seem to intend it; for the Rationalists, alas! can hardly be said to believe in "salvation through Jesus Christ,"—through One whom they deem a mere man, the fundamental doctrines of whose religion they reject, whose "Holy Spirit" they explain to mean "a fuller knowledge of the heavenly doctrine," and the descent of the Holy Ghost upon whom they conceive to be "the *Eastern* way of expressing his wisdom!" See Rose's Protestantism in Germany, Supplement.

point of fact, resolves itself into the assertions of the supreme pontiff of the church for the time being[2]. Here, then, the Church of England joins issue with the Church of Rome: she replies,—"Be it so, we wish only for the truth; 'we can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth'[3]; if, therefore, you can give us reasonable demonstration that this is as you affirm, we will—though it be never so antecedently improbable—confess our error and embrace tradition." Such is, in effect, the language of our church, who desires "truth in the church and the peace of the church together[4]," and grieves to rend that blessed oneness which her dying Lord invoked[5]. But "for too much love of peace" she must "not spare to speak necessary truth[6];" and, therefore, until Rome can give the proof required, she ceases not to teach,

---

[2] See a remarkable expression used by Sarpi in his account of the debates upon Scripture, at the Council of Trent:—D'autres, tenant pour certain et pour incontestable, que par l'Eglise il faloit intendre l'Ordre Ecclesiastique, et surtout le concile et le Pape, qui en est le chef, disoient, &c.—Le Courayer's Translation, sub an. 1546, p. 237.

[3] 2 Cor. xiii. 8.—i. e. so as to preserve the character of a Christian church.—The necessity of *duty:* Emmerling observes, that ἀλλ' ὑπὲρ τῆς ἀληθείας is for ἀλλ' ὀφείλομεν πάντα ποιεῖν ὑπὲρ κ. τ. λ.

[4] Archbishop Laud's Controversy. Preface, p. 12.

[5] John xvii. 20—23.

[6] Laud, ubi supra.

and is ever ready to contend for, the sole supremacy and absolute perfection of the written word of God.

The subject proposed.

This is the subject proposed for the following Essay.

We have been called upon to shew, that "the Holy Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrine required of necessity for eternal salvation through faith in Jesus Christ"; and we obey the call and address ourselves to the work with gladness, though not without diffidence; gladly, indeed, for we should be unworthy sons of the blessed Reformation, if we refused to come forward as often as was needful, in defence of the fundamental principle on which the whole fabric of that Reformation was reared, and for which our martyred fathers bled: but diffidently withal, for we well know the immeasurable importance of the question, and the cunning artifices of our opponents; and are reminded at every step, when "we think we stand, to take heed lest we fall."

Its great importance.

We have said that the question is a most important one; for it seems to be the point on which the whole controversy hinges, and which once settled, our brethren's remaining errors would stand a fairer chance of being soon amended; for while the "Rule of Faith" continues to be corrupt, the Faith itself cannot well be otherwise. The assertion, too, that the Holy Scriptures,

without a suppletory tradition, are insufficient to salvation, appears to be the πρῶτον ψεῦδος—the fundamental error of the papists; an error which on the one hand must create, in the minds of pious and sincere members of the Roman obedience, a most distressing uncertainty (inasmuch as he—whose creed may be enlarged by each successive pontiff, and whose salvation depends on certain traditionary rites and doctrines unembodied in any written and acknowledged formula—never can obtain that blessed peace of mind which may accrue to those who have a fixed and accessible standard of appeal whereby to prove themselves); and on the other hand, the deficiencies of Scripture being supplied by the authority of the Church, or rather by the voice and definition of the pope, a religion is produced imperious, interested, and tyrannical: for each pope having the same interests as his predecessors had, and being established by human power, will unalterably persist in their right and wrong, and impose irremediably and what he please, upon consciences over which they have made themselves the judges[1]. Furthermore, the Romish doctrine of tradition opens the door at once to heresy; for it deprives us of the catho-

---

[1] See Bp. Jer. Taylor, Dissuasive from Popery, Part II. Book I. Sec. ii. (Vol. x. p. 392. ed. Heber); who has an ingenious comparison between the religions of papists and fanatics.

lic rule of interpreting Scripture and distinguishing the true faith; in that, this tradition having been vouchsafed to and preserved in the Church of Rome alone, and never having been heard of in any of the other ancient and independent churches of Christendom, (allowing for argument's sake, that it has been held in that Church from the remotest antiquity[1]) we are thereby cut off from the appeal to the *quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*. Nor is this a new device of those who have swerved from the faith, and would "teach for doctrines the commandments of men:" for—not to speak of the Jews who "made the commandment of God of none effect by their traditions,"—we find that this has been the practice of heretics[2] in all ages of the Christian Church; as for instance, Tertullian tells us[3], that in his day "they contended, either that the Apostles were not fully instructed in the truth; or that

---

[1] Which, however, the following pages will prove is by no means the fact.

[2] It is not meant by this to assert that Romanists are heretics: on this point, the learned seem to be divided, though the majority incline to the more charitable opinion. See Mr Palmer's Treatise on the Church, Vol. i. p. 282—286.

[3] In his "De Prescriptione Hæreticorum," Ch. xxii. "Solent dicere, non omnia Apostolos scisse; eadem agitati dementia, qua rursus convertunt, omnia quidem Apostolos scisse sed non omnia omnibus tradidisse."—Routh's Opuscula, p. 134.

they did not communicate to the churches all the truths which had been revealed to them[4]."

Before proceeding further, it may perhaps be not amiss to stay for a few moments, to define some of the terms which will most frequently appear in the following pages; and, to state again more exactly, the difference between the Anglo-catholic and the Roman-catholic doctrines on this subject. *Tradition*, then, (which may be of two kinds) in the mouths of Romanists generally, means *unwritten* or *oral* tradition: they talk of the "nuncupative" as well as the "written testament" of Christ[5]; they say that this tradition having proceeded from the mouth of the Apostles (though not committed by them to writing, as they were

Definition of terms, and statement of the case.

'Tradition' defined.

---

[4] Bp. Kaye's Tertullian, p. 292, where he has inadvertently referred to the wrong chapters of the original. It is curious to observe the similarity of error in different ages; Bellarmine, in upholding this doctrine of tradition, uses words fearfully like those of the heretics which Tertullian condemned. He says (De Verbo Dei, Lib. IV. Ch. xi.) "that the Apostles committed all to writing which was commonly and publicly preached; and that all things are in Scripture, which men are bound to know and believe explicitly"; but then he adds, "that there were other things which they did not commonly and publicly teach; and these they did not commit to writing, but delivered them only by word of mouth to the prelates and priests and perfect men of the Church." Cited by Archbishop Tillotson, Rule of Faith, Part III. Sec. x.

[5] See Baldwin in Optat. cited by Archbishop Laud, Sec. xxvi. Num. 1, note.

too much busied to digest a systematic view of the whole truth revealed to them) is intrinsically binding; and, though indeterminate, yet accurate and available,—latent and yet living,—the uniform custom of the Church; and that therefore, in adhering to this, they believe and act as the Christian society have always believed and acted[1]. Some proceed to assert, that this "unwritten testament" was not merely a sufficient, but the only possible way of conveying a doctrine securely from age to age, and is the only record of the faith[2]. But this being the opinion of but comparatively few, and too bold an attempt to be commonly received, we pass on at once to that held by the generality of Romish theologians; viz. that all things necessary to be known and believed unto salvation are neither in express terms, nor by necessary consequence, delivered and contained in the Holy Scriptures, and that there is need of the tradition of the Church, as a supply in this case; and that, in fact, there

Popular Romish doctrine.

---

[1] See this stated at length, very clearly, by Mr Newman, in his Prophetical Office of the Church, viewed relatively to Romanism and popular Protestantism, pp. 39—41.

[2] *E. g.* in England one J. S. (Sergeant), author of a book entitled "Sure Footing"; see Archbishop Tillotson, Rule of Faith, Part I. Sec. ii. § 4., and Bishop Jeremy Taylor, Dissuasive from Popery, Part II. Book I. Sec. ii. p. 384 and seq., where he refers to the Hist. Concil. Trident. sub Paul III. A.D. 1546.

are some truths which have been given in this way only[3]. And, consequently, "the most of them doe teach, that the last thing to which the perswasion of our faith resolueth it selfe, and the maine ground whereupon it stayeth, is the authoritie of the Church guided by the spirit of truth[4]."

The Anglo-catholic doctrine differs from the foregoing, in that tradition by itself, and without scripture warrant, does not convey to us any article necessary to salvation; but is to be admitted merely as *confirmatory of the true meaning of scripture*, and is therefore not a rule distinct and co-ordinate, but subordinate and ministrative: that the Church's office is merely that of "a witness and keeper of holy writ[5];" and, consequently, that the only absolutely *authoritative ultimate standard* of appeal resides in the BIBLE. Anglican Doctrine.

The doctrine of the Church of England is concisely stated in the sixth of her Articles finally confirmed and subscribed at the Synod of London, in 1603—4. "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to

---

[3] See Bishop Bull's Vindication of the Church of England, Sec. v. § 3., and De la Luzerne, quoted by Mr Palmer, Treatise, Vol. ii. p. 46.

[4] Field, of the Church, Book IV. Ch. vi.

[5] Art. 20. Eccles. Anglic.

be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation." This is the doctrine we are about to maintain; by "things necessary" intending those things only, "without the knowledge and practice whereof, it is not the will and pleasure of God to make any ordinary grant of salvation[1]."

'Things necessary to salvation.'

'Scripture contains all doctrine.'

And by "scripture *containing* all doctrine," not meaning to hold, that all necessary doctrine is in Scripture set down *totidem verbis*, in express terms; but only that it is either so contained, or else comprehended in such sort, that we may by reasoning fairly *thence conclude* and *deduce* it. Thus much is admitted by the disjunctive particle of our sixth Article, "*nor* may be proved thereby;" and is held by Hooker[2] and Laud[3]. In fact, to assert that the express words of Scripture are required to prove an article of the faith, or that no doctrine can be *de fide*, which cannot so be proved, would lead to very serious difficulties; for first, several fundamental doctrines of Christianity are not contained in Scripture by express literal mention, but only deduced out of it, as *e.g.* the doctrines of the Trinity, the real Divinity of Jesus Christ, Original Sin, the Procession of the Holy Ghost, &c.; and secondly,

---

[1] Hooker, Eccl. Pol. I. Sec. xiv.

[2] Ibid.

[3] Conference, Sec. xv. Num. 1.

to say that no doctrine can be *de fide* not so contained in Scripture, would be to impute a most uncharitable error to the Catholic Church, which has condemned Arians, Socinians, Pelagians, Macedonians, &c. as heretics. In fine, this has always been the demand and subterfuge of heretics, from the time of the ancient Arians down to our English Deists, and the Rationalists of Germany[4].

---

[4] Thus Bretschneider challenges us to shew a single place in Scripture, where the words Trinity, Atonement, &c. are to be found; and accuses us of "confounding Church systems of doctrine and Biblical doctrines, which are very different things." See Rose's Protestantism, Appendix, p. 76.

CHAPTER I.

Argument from Scripture.

In prosecuting any enquiry relative to our most holy faith and discipline, the obvious course is in the first instance to apply to the Holy Scriptures, to see whether and how far they assist us—whether the matter in debate is contained in them, or may be proved from them. And it is not until we find them to fail us in one or both of these points, that recourse must be had to other and subsidiary means; for even if they should fail us, it by no means follows as a necessary consequence, that our proof is worthless, or our position false; this *must* be the case, only when it is *contrary* to Scripture. With these sentiments, deeming a scripture proof to be the simplest and most satisfactory, in commencing this enquiry I turned to the Bible; I sought for passages of Holy Writ; with much anxiety and pains I have considered and reconsidered those which several of our writers have employed: but—with all deference to these respectable and learned persons—I must concur with others[1] who have deemed this line of argument of questionable

Its validity examined.

[1] *E. g.* Mr Palmer is of opinion, that "this is an argument which might be omitted with advantage to the truth." Treatise, Vol. ii. p. 18.

value; I feel obliged, most humbly yet decidedly, to aver my conviction, that this mode of proof by arguments from Scripture is untenable; for that the texts adduced either admit of a very different interpretation, or else are not sufficiently comprehensive. I proceed to examine them.

Deut. iv. 2. "Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish aught from it."—Again, *Ps.* xix. 7. "The law of the Lord is perfect, converting the soul."—Of these two texts in the Old Testament, the first—considering the verses by which it is ushered in—seems either to enjoin obedience to God's commandments in general; for (as Grotius says) "addere ad legem est facere quod lex vetat, diminuere est omittere quod lex jubet," and so Bishop Patrick explains it: or else it relates to the uncorrupted preservation of the Law; and in this sense the Jews seem always to have understood it (see Dr Alix's Reflexions on the four last books of Moses).—Similarly, it is almost superfluous to say, that the famous passage, *Rev.* xxii. 18, 19, "If any man shall add," &c., must be understood as relating entirely to the uncorrupted preservation of the text *of the book of Revelations:* the sacred writer himself has limited the plagues to one altering "the words of the book *of this prophecy*[2]."

[2] Though it must be confessed, that Thomas Waldensis, Scotus, and Occam, seem to have taken it as referring to

But even were it to be granted that the Holy Spirit when inspiring St John to write thus, and directing the Church to place this book last in the sacred canon, *did* refer to the whole of Scripture; what then? I ask, what will this prove? not, surely, the point at issue: but merely—what none will gainsay, and what might have been found without creating surprise in every book of holy Scripture, just as it is found in the passage of Deuteronomy above quoted—that the words of this book being of Divine origin, no man could, without the height of impiety, alter them in any way;—the very reason why holy men have been at so much pains to collate manuscripts, and to render and retain the text as pure as possible.—The text from *Ps.* xix., considering the scope of the passage, merely speaks of the excellency of the law of God for a particular purpose. David had been saying, that "the heavens declare the glory of God,"—in other words, 'God is sufficiently declared to all the world by the marvellous works of his hands,

---

the whole of Scripture. However, I feel more convinced than ever of the correctness of the view advocated above, by a circumstance which has only lately come to my knowledge; that in the old arrangements of the Vulgate (i. e. prior to the Council of Trent, at which the order of the sacred books was resettled) the Apocalypse is placed before several of the Apostolical Epistles; and I am credibly informed, that there are very few manuscript copies of the Vulgate extant with a different arrangement.

having "not left himself without witness," so that any are "without excuse" who are so "simple" as not to render Him honour and worship; but to us Jews (he continues) He is conspicuous in a more excellent manner by the revelation made to Moses; his law therefore is *perfectly adapted* to convert our souls, and turn us from the vanities of the heathen to the one true Jehovah.'—At all events, neither of these texts intimates that the law of God is contained in *Scripture* only.

Luke i. 3, 4.—"It seemed good to me also .....to write unto thee in order,.....that thou mightest know the certainty of those things wherein thou hast been instructed." Whitby seems to think, that this proves the sufficiency of Scripture, by asserting the insufficiency of oral teaching to give Theophilus a knowledge of the certainty of these things. But how does this appear? St Luke's words, I apprehend, merely mean that Theophilus would now have a greater certainty as to these matters than he had before[1]. But at any rate, it is a weak argument to prove the sufficiency of Scripture by asserting the insufficiency of tradition; this, surely, will only prove that *something more* than tradition is requisite; e. g. *Scripture*

---

[1] Some commentators think that in ἐπιγνῶς, the ἐπι has an intensive force; and if so, this will corroborate our explanation.

together with tradition.—It might, perhaps, refute the doctrine of some Romanists (mentioned *supra* p. 12), that tradition conveys the whole Faith; though even to this an objection might be raised.

John xx. 30, 31.—"Many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book; but these are written, that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing, ye might have life through his name." This passage, as well as the foregoing, has been by some supposed to shew that Scripture contains all revealed truth; but if so, they will equally prove that it is contained in the particular Gospels in which they occur. But, it may be asked, does not this text shew that Scripture contains all doctrines required of necessity for salvation? I think not. It says that John recorded these "signs," that "they might believe that Jesus is the *Son of God*,"—i. e. that they might believe in the *Divinity* of Jesus[1]. Now, though this is the *primary* article of the Christian Faith, it cannot be said to be the *only* article necessary for salvation; if it contain all other fundamental doctrines, it can only do so by implication; and therefore to say, that whatever St John intended by

[1] It is well known, that St John's principal object in writing his Gospel, was to refute the errors of the Nicolaitans, Corinthians, and other Gnostics. This is expressly witnessed by Irenæus, adv. Hæres. III. 11.

the word "these" contains all doctrine required for eternal life, *because* it contains the one article of the *Divinity* of Christ, is as though one should say that St Paul, writing to the Corinthians who had denied another fundamental article, meant that his Epistle or his preaching contained all necessary doctrine, *because* they taught the *Crucifixion* of Christ[2]. It no more follows, as a necessary consequence, that the Scriptures contain all necessary doctrine because St John's Gospel teaches Christ's divinity, than because St Paul's Epistle teaches his humanity.

John v. 39.—"Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have eternal life; and they are they which testify of me." *Acts* xvii. 11. "These were more noble than those in Thessalonica, in that...they searched the Scriptures daily, whether these things were so."—These two passages seem very similar in their real meaning, and equally inapplicable for the purpose for which they are frequently adduced. Admitting, for the sake of argument, that the first is a correct translation, the Jews are herein merely directed to search the prophetical parts of the Old Testament, which

---

[2] St Paul writes, that he "preached Christ crucified, unto them that are called the power of God and the wisdom of God." And again, that he had "determined not to know anything among them save Christ crucified." The crucifixion of Christ was a necessary preliminary to his resurrection.

testified to the divine mission of Jesus. In the second the Berean Christians are praised for doing this very thing,—for searching in the Old Testament for *evidence* ("whether") of the truth of what St Paul had preached, viz. the sufferings and resurrection of Jesus Christ[1]. But surely in neither is there any reference to the question of tradition. 'The Old Testament might testify of *Christ*, and yet there *might* be also divine unwritten traditions, which though they did not testify of Christ, testified of other truths or duties.'

There are sundry other passages sometimes cited in proof of our thesis,—such as *Gal.* i. 8.—*Mat.* xv. 3. and xv. 9.; but these are, to our apprehension, so manifestly inadequate, that I pass them by merely observing, that in the first the Gospel is spoken of merely in the abstract, and the question of tradition left entirely untouched; in the second, reference is made to *human* traditions only, not at all to the subject of *divine* unwritten traditions[2]. But I hasten to the consideration of two passages which are most frequently adduced by zealous Protestants, and which—the latter especially—at first sight seem very strong, and would—if correctly applied—be convincing. They are

---

[1] See verse 3.

[2] This is also the opinion of the learned author of the Treatise on the Church.

Isa. viii. 20.—"To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them;" and 2 Tim. iii. 15, "From a child thou hast known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith that is in Christ Jesus." As to the former, not to insist upon our version being a mistranslation (which, however, seems nearly certain[3]), the passage is wholly irrelevant to the purpose for which it is so often cited. For it must either be read in connexion with the verse immediately preceding (see v. 19.)—which Bp. Lowth himself seems to prefer;—and then it will merely be a warning to the people of Judah against the idolatry and divination to which they were much addicted; and to resort for aid "to the living instead of the dead,"—to the oracles of the true God instead of the mutterings and enchantments of wizards. Or if it be taken (with Abp. Secker and Deschamps, quoted by Lowth) to refer to "the command" in v. 11—15, and "the attested prophecy" in v. 1—4, the meaning will not be very dissimilar,

---

[3] Bishop Lowth's note on the passage is as follows: '"It is because there is no light in them," says our translation: if there be any sense in these words *it is not the sense of the original;* which cannot justly be so translated. Qui n'a rien d'obscur; Deschamps.' The LXX. which renders *νόμον γὰρ εἰς βοηθείαν ἔδωκεν, ἵνα εἰπῶσιν οὐχ ὡς τὸ ῥῆμα τοῦτο, περί οὗ οὐκ ἔστι δῶρα δοῦναι περὶ αὐτοῦ*, affords us no assistance in this difficult passage.

viz. an assurance that God's promised Immanuel would be a far safer and surer defence for them to resort to and depend upon, than the Assyrians. One of these I take to be the true meaning of the passage. But even though it were correctly rendered in the English version, and even though it should be allowed to prove that the Old Testament was the proper and ultimate appeal, still it does not follow that this is *necessarily* extended to the New; that this and many other passages are *applicable* to the New Testament no Protestant would dispute; but this can only be on the principle of our seventh Article, that "the Old Testament is not contrary to the New." As little would it follow, even if we supposed that the Spirit had in view both the Old and New Testaments when directing Isaiah to place this command on record, that they *contain* absolutely all doctrine required for salvation; at most this text would only prove (what no Romanist denies) that our teaching must be "*according to*," i. e. not contrary to God's written word; but this is far from being tantamount to asserting the *sufficiency* of holy Scripture: as is proved by this; that Romanists, while setting up tradition on a level with Scripture, feel the necessity of at least shewing the *compatibility* of the traditional doctrine with the written word[1]; and

[1] Indeed, as often as they can, they try to *prove* their dogmas by Scripture.

therefore it is they allege the canonicity of the Apocrypha.

2 *Tim.* iii. 15—17. It is argued by zealous Protestants on this text, that the Scriptures which are "able to make wise unto salvation" must contain all necessary doctrine; and that if "*all* Scripture is given by inspiration of God, that the man of God may be perfect, thoroughly furnished unto all good works," then nothing further is wanting. Now, omitting for a moment the consideration of *what* Scriptures are here referred to, a reference to the Greek must surely make it evident to every scholar, that this is an argument built upon a bad translation, without regard to the original—*πᾶσα γραφὴ θεόπνευστος,...ἵνα ἄρτιος ᾖ ὁ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἄνθρωπος πρὸς πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἐξηρτισμένος.* The Greek for "all Scripture" would be—*πᾶσα ἡ Γραφὴ*[2]; whereas *πᾶσα γραφὴ* must mean "every Scripture," i. e. every *part* of the sacred writings; which would prove, not the sufficiency of the whole collected Canon, but the sufficiency of every book, chapter, and verse, by itself. But to proceed, in v. 15, St Paul manifestly refers to the Old Testament[3], which alone Timothy *could* have known "from a child;" yet the Old Testament did not *then* contain all revealed truth.

---

[2] Cf. Matt. xii. 25. *πᾶσα βασιλεία μερισθεῖσα καθ' ἑαυτῆς* and Rom. viii. 22. *πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις συστενάζει καὶ συνωδίνει.*

[3] It is thus understood by Whitby, Macknight, and Scott.

But the Apostle adds, "through faith which is in Christ Jesus;" that is, Timothy knowing well the Old Testament, added to this a belief in what he had learnt from the Apostle of Christ; and this was sufficient for salvation[1]: but be it remembered that Timothy had learnt all this doctrine of Christ from the Apostle *orally;* and that, *for all that appears on the face of it,* St Paul *might* have instructed him in doctrines which were not afterwards committed to writing. The text, then, can only mean that the Scriptures of the Old Testament together with the Christian doctrine are sufficient to make one "wise unto salvation"; a proposition admitted on all hands. It does not in the least affect the question, whether *the Scriptures* of the Old Testament together with *the Scriptures* of the New contain sufficiently all doctrine required of necessity for salvation through faith in Christ[2].

---

[1] Will not this text refute the ancient notion of the Demiurge? For if the Old Testament was able to make wise unto salvation through faith in Christ, the Giver of the Gospel could not have been a distinct person at variance with the Giver of the Law. It is curious that this same notion seems to have sprung up again in modern times; See Mosheim's Account of the Sect of Heretics called Bogomiles, A. D. 1179; who appear likewise to have held the same views as Valentinus in another particular, viz. in regarding the body of Christ to be merely a phantom.

[2] The argument supposed to be derivable from this text would appear to be a favourite both with the earlier and the modern defendants of the Reformation. Of the latter, Prof.

In short, will not the insufficiency of this mode of proof at once appear, if we attempt to prove, by arguments drawn from Scripture, the *uncanonicity* of the *Apocryphal* books? For to effect this, we must have in Scripture either an assertion that those books are not part of the word of God; or that the received thirty-nine books of the Old, and twenty-seven of the New Testaments, do contain the whole of God's word: but we have neither. We cannot prove the perfection of Scripture *from Scripture*, unless we can prove the canonicity of Scripture *from Scripture*[3].

This case parallel with the proof of the Canon.

Scholefield has lately laid great stress upon it in his Sermons before the University,—with what success it is not for me to say: of the former, Whitaker affords an example. He says,—"Scripturam esse *unicam* regulam fidei probo, quia est perfecta regula fidei. *Perfectam* autem esse hanc regulam ostendo ex Apostolo, qui ait ea sumi ex Scripturis posse quæ hominum Dei perfectum faciant. Si enim Scripturæ hominem Dei, h. e. ministrum Evangelicum, ἄρτιον 'perfectum' in omni parte muneris sui faciunt, perfectæ ipsæ sint necesse est."—Whitakeri adv. Stapletonum Duplicatio, Lib. II. Cap. x. p. 444., edit. Cant. 1594. Now, this is all very true, very good as a theological argument *à posteriori*, a very probable conclusion; but it is not a strict demonstration (and therefore useless to convince an adversary), because the passage only refers to the Old Testament.

[3] Archbishop Laud denies that Scripture can sufficiently witness to itself, "*lumine proprio*," that it is the "infallible will and word of God." Controv. Sec. xvi. Num. ix. 2.

A fortiori, then, it cannot prove its own sufficiency for salvation.

No proof from Scripture of the opposite doctrine.

But, let us pause here for a moment to make this further observation, that this admission affords the Papists no advantage; for neither can they prove from Scripture the opposite doctrine,—that any part of essential Christian truth is conveyed solely by unwritten tradition. The texts which their theologians (as Trevern, Milner, &c.) adduce for this are wholly insufficient. As *e. g.* (just to advert to two or three), 1 *Tim.* vi. 20. "O Timothy, keep that which is committed to thy trust;" and 2 *Tim.* i. 13, 14, "Hold fast the form of sound words which thou hast heard of me.....That good thing, which was committed unto thee, keep." We cannot better explain these passages, than as Tertullian in answer to the heretics of his day who quoted them for the self-same purpose; he says, then, "the context shews, not that any more secret doctrine is hinted at, but simply that the Apostle is admonishing Timothy not to allow any other doctrine to creep in different from that in which he had instructed him[1]. There is nothing to shew that these doctrines were not either then or afterwards committed to writing. As well might it be said, that when we teach catechumens the Creed or the Church Catechism, we teach them doctrines which are not contained

[1] Tertull. de Præscript. Hæret. Cap. xxv. Dr Routh's Opusc. p. 138.

in Scripture also. To mention one more passage; *Acts* i. 3, Christ "showed himself alive after his passion.....speaking of the things pertaining to the kingdom of God." It is improbable (say they) that all the things he then spoke of were afterwards committed to writing; particularly as St John declares, that "there are many other things which Jesus did, the which if they should be written," &c. To this we answer, that it cannot be proved that Christ did then, or afterwards, teach truths which were not committed to writing; nor that if he did, they were truths necessary for salvation, and as such, designed for the Church generally, and in all ages. There is, therefore, no proof, that God revealed any necessary truth which was not afterwards written.

So then, to return from this digression, it appears that clearly as Scripture speaks of the divine inspiration of some of its writers, yet it nowhere says that it, by itself, contains all necessary doctrine. "Indeed" (to borrow the words of a famous living author[2],) "from the beginning to the end of the New Testament (if we except the last words of the Apocalypse,) there is no recognition even of its own existence, no reflexion on itself, no putting forward of its claims as a *written* document." The most then, (as I venture to think) which can be

---

[2] Newman on the Prophetical Office of the Church, p. 331.

obtained from the Scripture mode of argument, is a *probability* that the Scriptures contain all necessary doctrine, and were intended by their divine Author to be the ultimate standard of appeal. Higher than this, it does not appear to me that we can attain.

The reason for dwelling on this.

I have been the more particular in examining the validity of this line of argument, for several reasons. First, because I felt, that when presuming to differ in opinion from several authors who have written on this subject, my superiors in age no less than learning, it was incumbent on me to shew (as in all humility it is hoped has been done,) that there were good grounds on which to rest my objections. There is also reason to suppose, that if this line of argument were as tenable as some have imagined, it would be conclusive: for were there a single text of Scripture from which the point, for which this Essay contends, could be clearly deduced as an inevitable consequence, Romanists must, on their own principles, yield assent; since, if they refused, they could not for a moment maintain their ground against Arians, Monophysites, Anabaptists[1], &c. Besides which I do conceive, that Gospel truth has not suffered more from the attacks of its enemies, than from

[1] See the Treatise on the Church, Vol. ii. p. 26, where Mr Palmer shews that the Romish theologians prove the points denied by these heretics *from Scripture.*

the system of interpretation pursued by some of its sincere—though indiscreet—friends, of arguing from detached portions and isolated texts, instead of comparing Scripture with Scripture, and referring to the scope of the whole passage[2]. Moreover in arguing a point, we must consider not what would satisfy friends,—those who really wish to be convinced of certain propositions, and are inclined to be favourable to the view we adopt; but, what will convince the adversary,—him who is prejudiced against our view: we must mentally change places with him, and candidly examine, whether—holding his views and influenced by his prejudices and interests,—we should be obliged to yield to one holding these arguments, as being honestly convinced by their force[3]. Thus, in the

---

[2] Thus it was with those who "went after heresies" in the days of Clement of Alexandria, of whom he says, "Although they do dare to use the Scriptures of the prophets, yet they use them not ..... as the whole body and contexture of the prophecy does dictate; but choosing out those things which are spoken ambiguously, they draw them to their own opinion." Clement of Alexandria cited by Bishop Taylor, Dissuasive, Part II. Book I. Sect. ii. From the same erroneous method of interpretation, Luther was induced, in the earlier part of his career, to denounce the Epistle of St James as "stramineam epistolam," an extravagance of which he afterwards repented.

[3] When will Protestants be convinced, that the only effectual method of conducting the controversy with Romanists is, to take them *upon their own grounds*—to turn upon

present case, there may be several texts, which a Protestant, anxious to get a proof from Scripture of a doctrine which is the foundation of his religious freedom, might perhaps deem conclusive; but in contending with a Romanist,—where one must weigh accurately the exact value of each argument,—it is labour lost, to cite passages to which he can reasonably object as mistranslations or clearly irrelevant. Quotations, to be worth anything in such a case, must not merely be applied as *illustrations* of the subject, but must so clearly be to the point, as to leave no loophole for escape

---

them *their own weapons?* Their church (they say) is infallible,—then prove that she has changed: their's (they tell us) is the "old religion,"—then prove that their errors are novelties. By resorting to the line of argument here proposed, how much useless jangling would be spared! The discreet portion of the reformed church would then be spared the pain of witnessing, and the church itself likewise would be saved the injury inflicted by, such exhibitions as the Downside and other recent controversies. For it is the acute remark of Bishop Horsley (Charges, p. 33), that "the propagation of *Methodism* hath been less owing to its own powers than to the injudicious manner in which it hath been resisted:"—a remark which surely applies with at least equal force to *Romanism.* The author begs to refer the reader to some exceedingly judicious remarks by the Rev. J. Endell Tyler, in a valuable book lately published, entitled "Primitive Christian Worship," Part I. Ch. II. Sec. i; and to a practical exemplification of this principle in a masterly sermon—"Popery refuted by Tradition,"—by Dr Hook, Vicar of Leeds.

to a fair honest mind, nor afford the shadow of a subterfuge to the versatility of a Jesuit.

There is a mode of proof closely connected with this line of argument, which Bishop Taylor has adopted; viz. that of stating what the necessary doctrines are, and shewing that Scripture contains them all. But I do not adopt it, for the following reasons. In the first place, it is extremely hard to determine precisely what *is* necessary to salvation; we are nowhere told in Scripture, how much or how little is absolutely required of all: in fact, there is scarcely a more "perplexed" subject, (to use Dr Waterland's expression) in the whole range of theology, than that of Fundamentals. And in the next place, the author hopes he may stand excused if he ventures to think this great man's argument here unsound. For he says (Dissuasive, Part II. Book I. Sec. ii. § 4.) that "if 'he, that believes Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, hath eternal life'.....it follows, that this being the affirmation of Scripture, and declared to be a competent foundation of faith, the Scripture that contains much more, even the whole economy of salvation by Jesus Christ, cannot want any necessary thing, when the absolute necessities are so narrow." But is the expression in 1 John v. 10 to be taken in so confined a sense? To believe on the divinity of Jesus is, beyond question, the first and most important step; but can it be

said, that a man whose belief was confined to this one article was sure of salvation? Is the doctrine of fundamentals to be so narrowed? If it is, why was Macedonius anathematized by the Council of Constantinople? And further, this appears to me to be a *petitio principii.* For suppose a papist to accept the Bishop's challenge, and say "Restat adhuc unum," "there *is* one thing wanting yet;" and then to allege one of their traditional doctrines,—say, Auricular Confession; I see not how he could be answered. True, this is not contained in Scripture; but neither is it—that I remember—forbidden. To attempt to prove that Scripture contains all necessary, by enumerating a page of doctrines, as Taylor has done; and saying, "thus you see, Scripture contains all necessary;" appears to me to be in effect saying,—"Scripture contains them, *because I think* Scripture contains them." But no Romanist, certainly, would be satisfied by this appeal to individual private judgment.

The alleged impossibility of tradition only conveying articles of faith, examined, and shewn to be not tenable.

There is one other line of argument (to which we will now briefly advert), which has been occasionally adopted;—that it is impossible God would have trusted any truths of revelation to Tradition. Now "if Christian tradition were indeed *entirely* unwritten, i. e. if uninspired writings did not remain, which attest sufficiently the universal belief of Christians from the apostolic age; it might readily be admitted, that tradition only

would be an uncertain proof of Christian doctrine. But there does not seem to be any impossibility, from the nature of tradition, that some truths of Revelation might be handed down by it, with the assistance of Divine grace[1]." Some persons argue that if a revelation be made at all, it *must* be written; for otherwise its very object would be defeated; since any thing committed to oral tradition must be uncertain and liable to corruption. Chillingworth, for instance, uses the following language: "The Scripture is a sufficient rule for those to judge by, who believe it to be the word of God, (as the Church of England and the Church of Rome both do) what they are to believe and what they are not to believe.....And my reason hereof is convincing and demonstrative, because *nothing is necessary to be believed but what is plainly revealed*[2]." Now I cannot admit, that a revelation, if made, must necessarily be plain; for as Bishop Butler says, (Anal. Part II. Ch. iii.) "We are not able in any sort to judge, whether it were to have been expected, that the revelation should have been committed to writing; or left to be handed down, and consequently corrupted by verbal tradition, and at length sunk under it, if mankind so pleased, and during such

[1] Treatise on the Church, Vol. ii. p. 21.

[2] Chillingworth, Answer ii. 104, cited by Mr Newman in his Lectures on the Office of the Church, p. 329.

time as they are permitted, in the degree they evidently are, to act as they will." Added to which, are the facts that tradition has been sufficient to transmit to us the abolition of the observance of the 7th day: as also that the text commanding to wash each other's feet was not to be taken literally, while that, relating to the consecration of the Eucharist, is: likewise that the Canon of Scripture is known to us solely by this channel. To say therefore, that tradition *must* be corrupted, while it would subject us to great difficulties, is clearly contrary to fact. And if tradition could convey one doctrine, there is no reason why it could not convey others, and therefore all. Hence we conclude that there is no antecedent *impossibility* that the Christian truths should have been trusted to oral tradition.

But let me not be misunderstood. I am not defending the notion, that tradition alone *was* employed to convey any essential doctrine: I shall shew presently, on the contrary, that it is in the highest degree improbable that it should be so employed. I am merely trying to shew, that the argument of the *à priori* impossibility of this, urged by some, is not tenable; in other words, that *à priori* it *is* possible that tradition might have been employed, and no Scripture have been given. At the same time, now that Scripture has been vouchsafed, we must be deeply sensible of

the goodness and wisdom of the Creator in having done so; and fully aware of the vast superiority which Scripture actually possesses as the Canon of Faith over oral tradition.

The object hitherto has been to clear the way.

In all that has been hitherto said, the object has been, not to find fault with others, not to display any fancied acuteness in our own powers of reasoning: but simply and sincerely believing that the time is fast approaching when England will again ring with the Romish controversy;—simply and sincerely to endeavour, by shewing where it appears to me labor has been lost, to save trouble and contract the limits of debate: and to point out what I humbly conceive to be the vantage ground, the firm position, on which we must rely. To this I proceed in the following chapter.

CHAPTER II.

THUS far we have advanced. It has been shewn that neither we nor the Romanists can bring any positive assertion of Scripture in proof of the doctrine maintained by us respectively. Now, admitting for argument's sake, that our's derives no greater *probability* from SCRIPTURE, but that both parties stand on equal ground:—if by any arguments we can shew, that in all human probability the position we are maintaining must be the true one; we shall manifestly have obtained an advantage over them: but if we can further prove, that the Universal Church has actually always borne its consentient testimony to our doctrine, that it *is* the case; then we shall have turned their own weapons against them, we shall have attacked them in their own strongholds, and they cannot honestly or consistently reject the conviction.

The line of argument to be adopted

Now, that "Scripture contains all doctrine required of necessity for eternal salvation" must be proved like any thing else, which, from its nature, does not admit of strict mathematical demonstration; in which case, since moral certainty is the

highest point of assurance at which we can arrive, with it we must rest content. Hence our line of argument will be twofold: we shall first urge various theological reasons, to shew the utter improbability that God would fail to preserve all essential doctrines in Scripture: and secondly, we shall prove that it is a matter of certainty, a positive historical fact, that the majority of the Christian Church has from the beginning been persuaded that all essential doctrines *are* preserved in Scripture[1]. Nor can it be objected to this mode of proceeding (as perhaps it might be *in limine*), that we have no right to appeal to reason, but must "hear the Church". In opposition to this we maintain that we have a right;—and not only so: but that it is the bounden duty of every Christian to appeal to that, upon which, as a "reasonable service," religion it-

stated to be twofold.

An objection *in limine* answered.

[1] Romanists are bound, in order fully to prove their point, to shew both that there was such a traditionary system as they uphold, and that it has lasted to this day; and that their peculiarities are parts of it. But since this peculiar dogma of their's, concerning the existence of a suppletory tradition, is that which necessarily must precede the others, so that their existence (so to speak) is involved in the admissibility of this; by proving that *this* is to be rejected as inadmissible, we shall in effect annihilate them *all*,—whether viewed as latent in the Church's teaching, or as having passed into writing and become fixed in decrees of Councils or amid the works of the ancient Fathers. Though, indeed, it were no difficult task to prove equally that *each* of them is novel and therefore erroneous.

self is and must be founded. This, however, has its limits: for it is the province of reason to examine into the divine pretension of the Gospel itself; and—even after it has been satisfied on that head—to try the doctrines, therein proposed to our acceptance, by the test of reason, so far as to ascertain whether any of them are contrary to its plain perceptions. Here, however, the office of reason ends, and that of faith begins. And surely it is no other than reason, speaking to us by the voice of conscience, which first inclines us to enquire after and embrace the Gospel at all. So then reason is prior to faith, prior to the Church, and prior to the Scriptures. But in the second line of argument proposed we shall enquire of the Church; not indeed the Church of Rome, but—that which includes the Church of Rome—the Church Universal.

The argument *à priori.*

I. I proceed to urge various theological reasons, to shew that it is utterly improbable that God would fail to have preserved in Scripture all essential doctrines. These may be classed under two general heads: I. reasons derived from the attributes of the Supreme Being; II. from the design of the Scriptures.

Class I. From the Divine attributes.

I. I reason from the attributes of the Supreme Being.

God's means are adequate to the end: the

1. Now, though we are unable to judge *how* it were to have been antecedently expected, that God

would have made his revelation to mankind, forasmuch as we could not have determined beforehand what would be his exact purpose in making it: yet, since a revelation has been made, and (part of it, at least) in a particular mode, and with a certain declared purpose,—which purpose it is daily answering; and since, from the beginning to the end of that revelation, we find no hint either of any other mode of delivery, or of any other purpose to be answered, being intended; is it not most reasonable to conclude, that the mode known to have been adopted, and the purpose confessedly intended, were perfectly and completely adapted to each other? And if so,—since it is an established truth, that God's means are always adequate to their ends, but never unnecessarily expended,—to have revealed any other truths than those contained in the written word, or to have employed any other medium of revelation besides that which He has employed—the purpose intended being on all hands confessed to be mainly the same;—this would argue a want of foresight, or a want of economy on His part, such as both reason, Revelation, and the analogy of Nature teach us is abhorrent from the Divine attributes.

Scriptures answer the end intended; therefore &c.

2. 'Whatever God intends to bring to pass, He has appointed means sufficient to that end.' This is an acknowledged axiom. Now the holy

God appoints means sufficient and without superfluity.

Scriptures are designed to instruct men and make them wise unto salvation: certain it is, then, that the Scriptures must be a sufficient means to that end. 'True,' it may be replied; 'but this is no proof that He has designed for that end Scripture only.' We have recourse, therefore, to another acknowledged principle before referred to,—that in God's works there is no superfluity. Hence if the Christian doctrine and discipline might have been propagated and preserved by unwritten tradition alone[1], unwritten tradition would have been sufficient: either the written or the unwritten tradition must be superfluous.

Now, either written or unwritten tradition must be superfluous.

Now although we do not deny, but that the circumstance of its being written adds to the law of God no authority and strength; although, too, we allow, that His laws do require at our hands the same obedience, in whatever mode they be delivered,—since every word of God is as much a rule as any word;—still we must be assured that the writings set before us *are* his laws[2]. If, then, God has thought fit to commit his law to

Shewn to be unwritten tradition.

---

[1] "The Christian doctrine and discipline might have been propagated and preserved by the unwritten word, or tradition, joined with the authority of the Church, though the Scriptures had not been composed; however profitable these most certainly are," &c. MILNER, *End of Controversy*, Let. 10.

[2] "There may bee a certainty of adherence, as the Schoolemen call it, without evidence; yet must the credite of him

something besides oral tradition; if He has repeatedly told us that the Scriptures are this law; and if He has given us no intimation of his having delivered *part* of his Law in any other way than by *written* tradition; can we do otherwise than infer, that this written tradition contains the *whole* Law? Hence we conclude, that it is the *unwritten* tradition which is superfluous; and therefore that there exists no such Divine unwritten tradition containing doctrines essential to salvation not found in Scripture, as some would fain persuade us. Hence also, from the existence of Scripture, we may infer that oral tradition alone was insufficient for the preservation of Christian doctrine in the Catholic Church in all ages.

Either, God would not allow doctrines of *equal* importance to rest on *unequal evidence*, or to be transmitted with *unequal* security. Or, if the doctrines be of *unequal* importance, they cannot all be *de fide*.

3. For what purpose, I ask, did the Apostles and Evangelists write respectively those treatises, which we call the Gospels and Epistles? They were unfolding the principles of the Christian doctrine. How utterly improbable, then, that with this end in view they should have failed to embody *all* the doctrines required of necessity for eternal salvation! That they may have omitted many things which would have conduced to our temporal advantage, or may even have failed to record many pious sentiments and examples which

---

that speaketh, bee knowen vnto vs, and wee must euidently discerne, that he doth speake vnto vs, vpon whose testimony wee rely." FIELD, *Of the Church*, B. IV. c. viii.

would have served greatly to edify us, may be admitted: but, that in writings which they *knew*—or, at least, the Spirit which guided them knew—were to serve as beacons to the Church militant for ever; to affirm that they therein omitted anything essential to the eternal well-being of the Church triumphant, is to say that—considering them merely in the light of human officers—they were totally incompetent to the discharge of their duty, totally unworthy of the trust committed to them.

But further, with what design did they commit to writing *any* doctrines? It must have been either, 1, to support them with a greater degree of evidence[1], and make them clearer to those to whom their writings were immediately addressed; or, 2, to preserve them better to future Christians; better, in as far as that which rests on record is more secure—has greater certainty of assurance, than that which "passeth from hand to hand, and hath no pens but the tongues, no book but the ears, of men to record it[2]." If their design was the *first* of these; then they either conceived the doctrines which they embodied in their writings to be *more important* than others which they omitted; and since the only thing which can make one doctrine more important than another, is that

[1] Luke i. 3, 4.
[2] Hooker, E. P. Book i.

the one is essential, and the other is not; that, consequently, which was not written was a non-essential, and therefore one which it cannot be lawful to require belief in as an article of faith:—or, if it be alleged that they considered those which they wrote and those which they wrote not to be of *equal importance;* but that they committed the former to writing, because they knew, from their peculiar tendency and from the nature of the hearts and habits of the generality of their converts, that they would be less easily received, and would therefore require greater evidence and urging; it comes to this,—that some equally important doctrines are supported by totally unequal evidence: a conclusion which is in the last degree improbable; nay, which is inconsistent with the wisdom and harmony observable in the works of Providence, and which, as calculated to mislead, militates against the equity of the Divine proceedings.

If the Apostles' design was the *second* of those above mentioned, there is a distinction at once recognised between the importance of the doctrines: for why should the sacred writers be more solicitous to provide a secure conveyance for one set of doctrines than for another, but from a conviction that the former were the more important of the two? therefore this case resolves itself into the last.

4. I argue, in the fourth place, from the fact of the *preservation* of the books of Holy Writ. God has preserved certain books, while

some He has allowed to perish: this can only be, because He knew that these are perfectly adapted to the end of their preservation.

It is acknowledged, that some books of Scripture have been undoubtedly lost[1]. It is also acknowledged, that it is owing to God's superintending providence that those which are extant have been preserved. Why, I would ask, should God have preserved them in particular, while he suffered others to fail; if it were not to convey a complete and authentic record of his revealed will? Were this record not complete, it would only partially and imperfectly accomplish the end of its creation. Now we can imagine, that to the inscrutable counsels of the Divine Mind, it might have appeared expedient to make no revelation at all to his creatures: but that, when he had determined to vouchsafe one, either the revelation itself should be incomplete, or the method of conveying it imperfectly adapted to accomplish His purpose; this is what we cannot conceive. It is incompatible with the goodness and the wisdom of the Most High. It is at variance with the habits of the Deity, as exhibited in the visible works of his hand around us. In the frame-work of nature all is harmony, all is perfection, nothing is wanting essential to the ends of its formation: "and shall it be

[1] Newman on the Office of the Church, &c. p. 343. However, this seems not to be acknowledged by all; (see H. Horne's Introd. vol. i. pp. 116—124.) Still though none were lost, this does not in the least invalidate the force of the argument in the text, drawn from the preservation of the Canonical books.

supposed that the new creation, the edifice of grace, is less harmonious and complete; that the Almighty Architect has been lavish of his pains in building up the world that now is, and presently passeth away, and has neglected that which is to remain for ever eternal in the heavens?"

Man is so prone to corrupt the truth, that tradition would have been a very insecure medium of transmission.

5. This section may well be concluded by a contrast with the foregoing argument. For having there argued from the preservation of the Scriptures, I shall here reason from the natural *tendency of man* to *corruption* and *apostacy from the truth.* This is proved by the history of the world. In the first ages the *credenda* and *agenda* of religion were but few and simple; the length of life vouchsafed to the patriarchs was so great as to afford considerable advantages for the uncorrupted propagation of their religion. Methuselah lived 300 years with Adam, and near 100 with Shem, and Shem outlived Abraham by 36 years; therefore but two hands were needed to convey a tradition down from Adam to Abraham—a space of upwards of 2000 years: and yet, few and simple as were the traditions, and great as were the advantages possessed by the patriarchs for their uncorrupted transmission, we find that the true religion had become so universally impure, that Terah was an idolater[1], and the Lord found it necessary to make

[1] Compare Gen. xii. 1. xxxi. 53. and Josh. xxiv. 2.

a fresh revelation to Abram. To preserve religion pure, He called him away from his country and kindred—set a mark on the bodies of himself and all his household and posterity, as a seal of the covenant and a badge of his Church—by a nomadic mode of life kept them from any lengthened intercourse with idolaters—and by frequently repeated revelations preserved alive the flame of the true knowledge of Himself "by the space of 430 years." Yet, when his people had become a great nation, we find the Divine Wisdom no longer trusting the transmission of His will to oral tradition[1]; but—with many aweful accompaniments calculated to make an indelible impression on the minds of the beholders and their children — presenting them with a graven record of the law, and in the course of ages causing the sacred writings to be multiplied. Again, with that unity of purpose which pervades all the words and works of Omniscience, when by His Son Jesus Christ our Lord, who is over all God blessed for ever, He made a new and more perfect revelation to mankind; we still find that the Author of Truth having at length withdrawn his visible presence from his Church,

---

[1] Jusque-là (au temps de Moïse) le souvenir s'en étoit conservé uniquement par la tradition; mais quand la vie des hommes s'abrégea, et qui les peuples se multiplièrent, Dieu voulu que cette tradition fût fixée par l'écriture.—La Mennais, *Essai sur l'Indifference*, t. iv. p. 154.

chosen men were moved by the Holy Ghost to indite the sacred record. Nor does the contrast end here. The former revelation was intended merely for the children of Israel after the flesh; the latter, for the children of promise, even for all unto the ends of the earth: therefore if for the one it was needful that the word be written, *à fortiori* for the other. The former was accompanied with continual proofs of God's miraculous presence among his people,—the Sabbatical year—the Urim and Thummim, &c.; yet, even then the Jewish nation could not be restrained from following after "strange gods:" nor was the faith of the patriarch[1] preserved entire; for so doubtful was the tradition of the Resurrection among the Jews, that one part openly denied it. What, then, would this fundamental[2] doctrine be reduced to now that the Sun of righteousness has so long set upon His Church, could we not betake ourselves, our doctrines, and our deeds, to the reflected light of Holy Writ[3]? But the Lord is good; who knew whereof his creatures are made, and would not entrust to the

---

[1] Job xix. 25—27. [2] 1 Cor. xv. 13, 14.

[3] John iii. 21.—So early as the Apostolic age some seem to have corrupted this doctrine, as Hymenæus and Philetus: See St Austin, Epist. 119. ad Januarium.—For some curious details on the differences among the Jews on this point, see Dr M'Caul's Judaism and the Jews, ch. iv.

flickering beams of oral tradition any doctrine essential to our eternal welfare.

Class II. From the design of Holy Writ.

II. The second class of our arguments, on the improbability of any essential doctrine having been omitted in Scripture, is drawn from the design of the Scriptures.

Scripture was designed to be a perpetual authentic record.

1. It appears to me that the very fact of the new Revelation having been given,—of the publication of this particular dispensation of Divine Providence, goes to prove our case. 'Revelation (as Bishop Butler writes[1]) is an authoritative publication of natural religion.' The Christian Revelation is a republication of the former Revelation, with certain additions and peculiarities, and (so to speak) corrections: the former revelation regarded a dispensation which was imperfect and to continue only for a given number of years; the latter concerned the perfect dispensation, and which was to endure until the end of time. Hence, though there might perhaps have been some slight shadow of ground for saying that the Book of the Revelation of the Old Dispensation did not contain sufficiently all doctrine required of necessity for salvation (though for this it seems difficult to imagine that any real ground could have been discovered); yet there could not, by possibility,

---

[1] Analogy, Part II. Chap. i. Sec. i.

be any for such an assertion with regard to the Book of the New Revelation.

For let us consider. It was an authoritative publication of rules regarding a dispensation confessedly to last for ever; its very authority would show it was to be referred to as the Rule of faith, and that by all in every age; for no more perfect Revelation was to be expected, since no more perfect would be needed. Certain men were employed, and endued thereto with supernatural powers, to record it: but with what conceivable design—for what possible end could it be recorded, unless to preserve to all ages an authentic and untainted record; and to afford greater certainty to its statements, and therefore greater confidence to those who should apply to it for guidance! This cannot but be admitted, and if so, how can it be with reason pretended, that *part* only was recorded? Whatever Providence foresaw would be necessary for the preservation of part of the Law by which His creatures are to be judged, must be equally so for *all* of it. At least, if not, then it becomes necessary to enquire, *why*;—what there was in different portions of His revelation, which would cause the Allwise to convey them to future ages, and to provide for their continual preservation, by means totally diverse? And it rests with our opponents to furnish the answer.

2. Our risen Lord had ascended, and his in- Scripture was design-

ed to be an effectual safeguard.

spired Apostles had been actively engaged on their ministry, for some years[1] before ever they thought of putting upon record any of the doctrines which they taught. God, however, foreseeing that the precious deposit of the faith could not be long entrusted to "earthen vessels" without some safeguard against heresies—which He knew would burst upon His Church; in mercy moved holy men to write various treatises and letters, as occasion served—whether for instruction or reproof, for comfort or advice; and which, being afterwards collected, compose the volume of the New Testament: these He has preserved to be an effectual safeguard[2] of the doctrine delivered by our Lord to his Apostles, to be by them handed

---

[1] The first Epistle to the Thessalonians is almost universally allowed to have been the first written of all the Apostolic Epistles (and, if we reject the idea of St Matthew's Hebrew Gospel, first of the whole New Testament); and taking its date to be even about A. D. 47, assigned by Burton, in his History of the Christian Church, p. 84, that would leave an interval of 16 years between it and the Crucifixion.

[2] This is acknowledged by Romanists. See, for example, La Mennais:—"L'utilité de l'Ecriture est d'ailleurs assez évidente (2 Tim. iii. 16, 17). Comme la tradition sert à en déterminer le vrais sens, elle sert elle-même à prouver l'antiquité de la tradition; elle en fortifie l'autorité; elle montre que la religion, ses dogmes, ses commandemens sont irrévocables; elle contribue à fixer la language de la foi, et par conséquent la foi elle-même." *Essai sur l'Indifférence*, t. iv. p. 160.

down to their successors in the Church until His second and glorious advent. I say an *effectual safeguard;* for it is impossible, that what Apostles wrote by inspiration should contradict what by inspiration they had spoken; and hence it is, that the Scriptures furnish the touchstone, by which the apostolicity of any doctrine may be tried.—But could they be this effectual safeguard, except they were perfect? In order to serve this purpose, they must be both conservative (i. e. of the truth) and preservative (i. e. against error);—they must not only act as a test to detect falsehoods, but—being to last for ever—they must possess that fullness of perfection in themselves, (like a thoroughly furnished laboratory) that they may be able to prove any and every doctrine which in the course of time may be broached.

Scripture was designed to supply the place of living inspiration.

3. Further; it will have appeared from what has been said in the foregoing argument, that (as it has been expressed) "Christianity did not grow out of the New Testament, but the New Testament out of Christianity";—in other words, while the Spirit of inspiration abode with the Church, the Church was the primary and unerring source of teaching; and by enquiring what the Church *then* believed, the truth or falsity of any doctrine could be ascertained. But this was not to last always; the supernatural gifts of the Spirit were gradually withdrawn, and the inspired Scrip-

tures were given;—given, for what conceivable purpose, but to supply the place of the living and immediately superintending Spirit of inspiration! Henceforth, then, the ultimate appeal was to lie, not with the doctrines of the then existing Church, but with what she had held from the beginning. How could this be ascertained—where was this to be found, but in those Scriptures which had been dictated by that Spirit of truth while presiding over her effectually, and as it were visibly, in the beginning? The Oracle was dumb, yet his responses were preserved; and the answer, which aforetimes had been obtained immediately from Him, was henceforth to be sought mediately through them. Clearly therefore, if the written word was to be applied to in place of the living Inspiration (if we may be allowed the term),—if it was to fulfil the office and serve the purpose of the primeval Guide, it must be furnished with all that Inspiration's capabilities. But the Spirit of inspiration being the Spirit of truth, could guide into all truth; therefore also can the written word[1].

From the tenor of the writings of the New Testament.

4. But, indeed, "the whole tenor of the Apostolical writings, as well as of our blessed Lord's discourses, runs counter to the supposition

[1] Of course this must be understood to be limited to all essential truth, which is all we are concerned about; for it has been before shewn, that it is not to be expected that the Divine Economist would reveal any thing unessential.

that any truths of fundamental importance would be suffered long to rest upon so precarious a foundation as that of oral tradition[2]." In perusing the Gospels we behold our Lord always leading the minds of His disciples away from non-essentials; teaching them to leave the shadow, and grasp the substance. We discover a peculiar earnestness and importance pervading whatever the Apostles wrote: if they advised upon their own authority, or had need to write of some private matters, we find them either acknowledging the one, or crowding in the others at the end of the epistle. Considering all this;—considering too, that a difference is observable in the style of St Paul when writing to Churches which himself had planted, and to one to which an Apostle in person had never declared the whole counsel of God[3],—a greater regularity of structure and nearer approach to a systematical treatise being observable in the latter case; considering (what no unprejudiced mind can doubt)

---

[2] Bishop Kaye's Tertullian, p. 303. The passage forms part of some valuable remarks of that learned prelate's on the subject of Tradition viewed relatively to the Romish controversy.

[3] It seems to be the most probable opinion, that the Church of Rome was planted by some of the "strangers of Rome" (Acts ii. 10), who heard Peter preach and were converted at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost. This is the opinion of Benson, Michaelis, Rosenmüller, and others. See H. Horne's Introd. Vol. iv. p. 363.

that the whole end which the sacred writers seem to have had in view, is "to lead mankind to their truest and best happiness, both here and hereafter;" that "they inform our reason, and guide our consciences[1]:"—is it not—can any conscientiously affirm but that they believe it to be—the most improbable thing possible, that writings such as these should fail to contain every doctrine and precept important for a Christian to know and believe to his soul's health; while some things[2] are introduced, which are acknowledged now to be non-essentials?

Here then, we bring this portion of our argument to a conclusion, in the belief that the reasons we have stated, when taken together, compose such a body of antecedent improbability against the Romish doctrine of the incompleteness of Holy Writ, as nothing but the most solid proofs to the contrary can controvert. That a reference in the outset to Scripture itself, would have been the simplest and most satisfactory mode of proof, I take to be a self-evident proposition; but in default of that (for reasons already stated), the foregoing line of argument has been adopted.

---

[1] Gilpin's Sermons, Vol. iv. p. 335.

[2] As several rites and regulations, such as washing of feet, the kiss of peace, the prohibitions of long hair, &c.—The reader will observe that there is no contradiction between this and note ([1]), p. 54. The observation there refers to doctrines.

That *à priori* arguments, indeed, when founded on individual private judgment will sometimes lead astray, I am ready to allow[3]; but I submit, that the foregoing line of reasoning has an advantage over a mere *à priori* proof; in that, part of it is derived from (as I apprehend) the indisputable design of the Scriptures, as known from their own internal evidence, no less than by common sense.

The superiority of this to a mere *à priori* argument.

But we are not willing to rest our cause on this alone: having, therefore, hitherto spoken of the sufficiency of Holy Scripture for salvation as a *doctrine*, we proceed now to treat it as a

[3] A remarkable example of this is to be found in Archbishop King's elaborate Essay on the Origin of Evil, "wherein he endeavours to prove, by arguments *à priori* drawn from the nature of God and the true notion of created beings, that the existence of evil, both natural and moral, *could not have been originally avoided*."—(Bishop Van Mildert's Boyle Lectures, Vol. i. Appendix, p. 467.) But since we have a written Revelation assuring us to the contrary, and that too in the judgment of the Catholic Church (see Bishop Bull's Discourse on "the First Covenant and the State of Man before the Fall." — Works, Vol. ii., Ed. Burton); we cannot but agree with the Archbishop when he shortly after confesses, that it is "better solved from Revealed than Natural Religion, and that the necessity of a *Revelation* is from hence rightly proved. For since the true cause which gave rise to this is a matter of *fact*, viz. the fall of the first man, it cannot be discovered merely by the strength of reason; but we stand in need of *Historical* traditon to transmit this, as well as other matters of fact, down to us."—Ch. v. Sect. v. Subject 6.

fact; having considered it as what *must* be the case, we now propose to look on it as what in fact *is* so; and shall in the next chapter beg the reader to go along with us, while we travel through the delightful regions of Antiquity, and cull from the fragrant beauties of the good and great of purer days such flowers as shall serve to mark — as though with one consent—the path of TRUTH, in which the Church of Christ has ever loved to walk.

CHAPTER III.

II. 1. In commencing this second part of our proof, we would pause for a moment, yet once more to deprecate any notice of our being guilty of the very fault which we are endeavouring to prove to be a fault in the case of the Romanists; viz. of resorting to Antiquity *instead* of our Bibles, and of setting up Tradition as a rule of faith and a guide *independent* of Scripture. Such is the plan with papists; but such was not the plan of the primitive Church, such has not been the plan of the Church of England, and God forbid that such ever should be the plan adopted by any of her sons. In any question, if Scripture plainly speaks to us of it, that is of course enough for a Christian;—to any one believing in the inspired character of the sacred volume, that volume's declaration on any point is a decisive proof of its truth: but when the Scriptures do not expressly contemplate the matter in debate, (as I venture to doubt that they do in the present case) we must have recourse to other and subsidiary means. By one of these I have already examined our point. But "leste I should seame to sette by my owne

The argument from antiquity.

conceite more then is meete, or lesse to regarde the doctrine of the olde ecclesiastical writers, then is conuenient for a manne of my poore learning and simple witte for to dooe: And because also I am in dede perswaded that the olde ecclesiastical writers vnderstode the true meaning of Christ in this matter, and have both so truely and so plainly sette it forth in certaine places of their writinges, that no man which wil vouchsafe to read them, and withoute preiudice of a corrupte iudgement will indifferently wey them, and construe their mindes none otherwise, then they declare themselfes to haue meant, I am perswaded I saye, that in reding of them thus no man can be ignorant in this matter, but he that will shutt vp his owne eies and blindfeld hymself[1]:"—for these causes we appeal to "the olde ecclesiastical writers," (individually of no authority, but considered in the light of competent moral witnesses[2]),—and we ask of them to bear testimony to the *fact*, whether, or no, the Universal Church has from the beginning held, that the 'Holy Scriptures do contain all doctrines required of necessity for eternal salvation

---

[1] Bishop Ridley's Treatise against Transubstantiation.—Enchirid. Theol. I. p. 89.

[2] "To these we also add, not as authors or finishers, but as helpers of our faith, and heirs of the doctrine apostolical, the sentiments and Catholic doctrine of the Church of God, in the ages next after the Apostles."—Bishop Taylor, Dissuas. Part I. Ch. i. Sect. i.

through Jesus Christ;' and what we find to have been held "*semper ubique, et ab omnibus,*" that we believe, in so grave a matter as this before us, must be according to the mind of that Spirit of truth which our Lord promised should be with his Church for ever. And be it observed, that this mode of procedure has a twofold advantage[3]: for first, it is—as has been already hinted—turning our adversaries' acknowledged weapons against themselves, and really accomplishing what they pretend to do[4]; and secondly, it is proving that

The advantages of this mode of procedure.

[3] "This mode of procedure we now choose, not only because to them that know well how to use it, to the sober and moderate, the peaceable and the wise, it is the best, the most certain, visible, and tangible, most humble and satisfactory; but also because the Church of Rome doth, with great noises, pretend her conformity to antiquity."—Bishop Taylor, Dissuas. *loc. cit.*

[4] The Church of Rome professes, that "her intention is, to set forth the true and sound doctrine..... which Christ Jesus taught, his Apostles handed down, and the Catholic Church by the aid of the Holy Spirit has *perpetually* retained" [sacrosancta Tridentina synodus ..... exponere intendit omnibus Christi fidelibus veram sanamque doctrinam ..... quam Christus Jesus—fidei nostræ auctor et consummator—docuit, Apostoli tradiderunt, et Catholica ecclesia Spiritu sancto suggerente perpetuo retinuit—Sess. 6, Proœm.]: and she wills not that anything be taught "counter to that sense of Scripture which holy Mother Church has held and holds, ... or even contrary to the *unanimous* consent of the Fathers" [contra eum sensum, quem tenuit et tenet sancta mater ecclesia, ... aut etiam contra unanimem consensum Patrum—Sess. 4. Decret. de Editione, &c.]. Yet how little she reverences the "sensum quem tenuit," may

our own Church, so far from having innovated upon the doctrines of the Catholic Church, (as

---

be judged of by the fact, that when she found it convenient—for the maintenance of her power—to sanction the withholding the cup from the laity at the Sacrament of the altar, she scrupled not to decree, that "although Christ instituted the Sacrament in both kinds, and the primitive Church retained the same mode of administration, THESE FACTS HOWEVER NOTWITHSTANDING, the custom of the Church is to be adhered to, whereby the laity are communicated under the species of bread only" [licet Christus sub utraque specie instituerit, eumdemque administrandi modum Ecclesia primitiva retinuerit, his tamen non obstantibus, consuetudo Ecclesiæ—qua sub specie panis tantummodo a Laicis suscipitur, est observanda—Concil. Constantiense, Sess. 13.].—Cave, Hist. Litt. Tom. ii. p. 322, *sub an.* 1414. That "the custom of the Church" had not existed very long, see Cardinal Bona's remarkable confession, that communion under one kind had not been heard of *till the* 12*th century*. "Certum est, omnes passim clericos et laicos, viros et mulieres, sub utraque specie sacra mysteria antiquitus sumsisse, quum solemni eorum celebrationi aderant, et offerebant, et de oblatis participabant ..... Semper enim et ubique ab ecclesiæ primordiis usque ad sæculum duodecimum sub specie panis et vini communicarunt fideles: cœpitque paullatim ejus sæculi initio usus calicis obsolescere, plerisque episcopis eum populo interdicentibus ob periculum irreverentiæ et effusionis. ..... Hæc mutatio facta est primum a diversis episcopis in suis ecclesiis, deinde a synodo Constantiensi canonica sanctione pro omnibus stabilita.—(Bona, Rer. Liturg. Lib. II. Ch. xviii. Sec. i. cited in Bingham's Christ. Antiq. Book xv. Ch. v. Sec. i.). An assertion which is confirmed by the fact, that the Greek custom of administering the bread dipped in the wine (a step which preceded the entire withdrawal of the cup) only began in the Roman Church in the eleventh century; for

Romanists pretend[1]) and having thus separated from it[2]; she does in fact hold the faith, not only which the ancient Church held, but—as I hope to shew—which *the Church* of Rome at this day continues to hold, however widely the majority of her theologians may have departed from it.

Why more passages are not extant bearing on this subject.

Nor let it be retorted, that, if out of all the works of antiquity we can produce so comparatively few witnesses, we cannot hereby prove our position. For why (I would ask) is it, that in the early writings we discover so few, and those incidental, passages to our purpose? why do we not find any treatise either in whole or in part dedicated to this,

---

about A.D. 1054 Cardinal Humbertus, Bishop de Sylva Candida, inveighs against it as an unheard of abuse, and in 1095 it was first ordered in the West by Pope Urban II. in the Council of Clermont.—See Bingh. Book xv. Ch. v. Sec. ii. See the Addenda.

[1] As *e. g.* Bossuet, in his Hist. des Variations des Eglises Protestantes.

[2] In proof that we did not, see Dr Wordsworth's Christian Institutes, Vol. IV. p. 313, and Palmer's Treatise on the Church, Part II. Ch. vii. It seems to the author of these pages, that a chief excellency of the Compendious Ecclesiastical History lately published by Mr Palmer (if, indeed, he may be allowed to pass any judgment on the work of so eminent a divine), consists in the writer's having kept steadily in view the importance of shewing, that the promise of the Saviour has been made good to his Church; and that "the same doctrines which were universally received in the second century are still so in the nineteenth."

now important, subject? why, but that in those days it was not a matter of debate; none, save such as were notoriously branded with heresy, had denied the perfection of Holy Writ: which while it shews us why there are comparatively so few notices, renders such as remain the more valuable. And this—it may be observed in passing—is the true use of the tradition of the Church, viz. as the test—the *exegetical* touchstone of Holy Scripture. And the application of this is the true and only method of conducting—not the Romish only, but—any controversy. Men may appeal for ever to Scripture, and be no nearer the end of their debate, since each party may claim the same texts, believing his own interpretation of them to be the true one. But if, leaving this self-sufficient licentiousness of private judgment, and "standing in the ways and asking for the old paths," and deferring to the consentient testimony of the Church, either party can show as an historical fact the *novelty* of the other's doctrine; the debate is at an end, this *novel doctrine must be false.* Thus we know, for example, that the Calvinistic doctrine of partial redemption and absolute predestination is heretical. And he who, in arguing these points, expected to find many passages in the early Fathers directly bearing upon them, would—if I mistake not—find himself disappointed (just as in the present subject); since these doc-

trines appear not to have been heard of in the Church prior to the end of the fourth century[1].

Yet of such as remain it would be impossible to quote all[2] within the space to which we must confine ourselves: a selection, therefore, has been made of about twenty of the most famous Fathers, who seem to speak most clearly as to the sense of the Church in the ages in which they respectively wrote. And in order the better to shew the *quod ubique*, as well as the *quod semper*, they are arranged under the three great divisions of the Egyptian, Oriental, and Western Churches.[3]—We begin with

THE EGYPTIAN CHURCHES.

THE EGYPTIAN CHURCHES. Cent. 5

In 412. *Cyril*, who succeeded Theophilus in the See of Alexandria, and was afterwards presi-

[1] For a brief history of this pestilential heresy, see Bishop Bull's Apol. pro Harmon. Sect. vii. § 21. and seq. Vol. IV. p. 440, ed. Burton.

[2] The author's note-book refers to some sixty passages besides those which he has here cited. Of course, at his age, it cannot be expected that more than a small portion of them are the result of his own reading in the ancient authors; the rest he has taken from some of our learned writers who have treated on this subject. He has, however, verified them all.

[3] It appeared that, in an essay like the present, the end in view would be sufficiently attained by this, without noticing those smaller divisions of the Church, which in a larger work would undoubtedly be followed. In the present divisions, the Egyptian Churches include the civil dio-

dent of the great Synod of Ephesus, writes[1], "That which the holy Scripture hath not said, how forsooth shall we receive and account it among the things which be true?"

Cent. 4. 385. *Theophilus* himself—the enemy of St Chrysostom—in speaking of some of Origen's subtle explanations, says[2], "It is the natural impulse of a devilish spirit to follow the sophisms of human minds, and to think any thing divine beyond what Scripture authorises."

350. *Athanasius*, another patriarch of that Church, and the great defender of the Catholic Faith against the Arians, affirms[3] that "the Catholic Christians will neither speak, nor endure to hear any thing in religion that is a stranger to Scripture; it being an evil heart of immodesty

---

cese of Egypt: the Oriental Churches comprise the Oriental, Asiatic, Pontic, Thracian, Macedonian, and Dacian dioceses: and the dioceses of Illyricum Occidentale, Africa, Spain, Gallia, Britain, and Italy (comprising the Roman Prefecture), are included under the Western Churches. See Bingham, Eccl. Antiq. Book IX.

[1] Ὁ γὰρ οὐκ εἴρηκεν ἡ θεία γραφή, τίνα δὴ τρόπον παραδεξόμεθα, καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀληθῶς ἔχουσι καταλογιούμεθα;—Cyril. Alex. Glaphyra in Pentateuch. Lib. II. p. 29, Tom. i. Oper. ed. 1638.

[2] "Ignorans (Origenes) quod dæmoniaci spiritus esset instinctus, sophismata humanarum mentium sequi, et aliquid extra scripturarum authoritatem putare divinum."—Theoph. Alex. Epist. Pasch. ii. Bibl. Patr. 1618. Tom. iv. p. 716.

[3] Athan. Exhort. ad Monachos, cited by Bishop Taylor, Dissuas. p. 403.

to speak those things which are not written."—Again,[3] "Our faith is correct, and is *derived* from Apostolical teaching and the tradition of the Fathers, *being established* out of the New and Old Testaments." Again, having recounted the Apollinarian tenets, he continues[4], "These men's extravagance merited a more detailed exposure; however, I stopped here, since a greater prolixity would be out of place in a letter. For doctrines which are unsound, as these are on the very face of them, ought not to be too curiously discussed,

---

[3] "Illorum enim [scil. Arianorum], ut prædixi, istiusmodi insania est ac improbitas: nostra contra fides recta est, et ex doctrina Apostolica et traditione Patrum confirmata, et novo et veteri testamento." Athan. ad Adelphium, p. 109, versio Lat. Paris. 1572.

[4] "Nam ista nec dictu, nec auditu tolerabilia sunt apud Christianos, sed omnibus modis aliena ab Apostolica doctrina. Ideo et ego, ut ab illis dicta fuere, nudis verbis in epistola describi curavi, ut qui vel solum audiat fœditatem illorum et impietatem statim oculis animadvertat: etsi pluribus verbis eorum stultitia, qui hoc malo laborant, exagitari merebatur, plura tamen non addidi, quod epistolæ non conveniret ulterior prolixitas. Quæ enim ita manifesto prava perversaque sunt, ea curiosius tractare non oportet, ne contentiosis hominibus ambigua videantur; sed tantummodo ad ea respondendum est quod ipsum per se sufficit, ea orthodoxæ Ecclesiæ non esse, neque majores nostros ita sensisse. Ceterum, ne ex solido silentio occasionem impudentiæ sibi malorum inventores comparent, rectius est, si pauca ex sacris voluminibus recitemus. Quid enim, si ita pudefacti sordidas istas comminiscentias abjiciant?"—Athan. ad Epictetum Epist. p. 79.

lest disputatious men should take it as a proof that there is no clear case against them: they ought to receive this answer and nothing beyond—'It is enough that these are not the doctrines of the orthodox Church nor of the Fathers.' However lest these devisers of evil shall be emboldened by our continual silence, it may be well to bring to memory a few things from Holy Scriptures; since this may shame them perhaps from pursuing their unseemly theories." And he thence confutes them at large. So then Scripture, in this great man's view, was the foundation of the "Church's doctrine" and the ultimate appeal, sufficient to convince when nothing else would avail. And this he testifies most unequivocally in another place[1]; —"The holy and divinely inspired Scriptures are sufficient of themselves to the discovery of truth."

Cent. 3. 228. In this century writes *Origen*[2], "All the Scriptures (says he) according to the Preacher,

---

[1] Αὐτάρκεις μὲν γάρ εἰσιν αἱ ἅγιαι καὶ Θεόπνευστοι γραφαὶ πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἀληθείας ἀπαγγελίαν. Athan. adv. Gent. Tom. i. Op. p. 1.

[2] Καὶ γὰρ πᾶσαί εἰσι κατὰ τὸν Ἐκκλεσιαστὴν* αἱ γραφαὶ, λόγοι σοφῶν ὡς βούκεντρα, καὶ ὡς ἧλοι πεφυτευμένοι, οἳ παρὰ τῶν συνθεμάτων ἐδόθησαν ἐκ ποιμένος ἑνὸς, καὶ οὐδὲν περισσὸν ἐξ αὐτῶν. εἷς δὲ ποιμὴν τῶν λογικῶν ὁ λόγος, δόξαν μὲν ἐχόντων διαφωνίας τοῖς μὴ ἔχουσιν ὦτα εἰς τὸ ἀκούειν, τὸ δὲ ἀληθὲς συμφωνότατα· ὡς γὰρ αἱ διάφοροι τοῦ ψαλτηρίου ἢ τῆς κιθάρας χορδαὶ, ὧν ἑκάστη ἴδιόν τινα φθόγγον καὶ δοκοῦντα μὴ ὅμοιον

* Eccles. xii. 11.—of course, according to the LXX.

are 'words of the wise as goads and as stakes well planted, given as secret cyphers from one Shepherd'; nor is there aught superfluous in them." Then, after beautifully comparing the agreement of all parts of Scripture with each other, when explained by one "well taught in God's harmonies," to the concordant tones of a harp, he continues thus: "For he knows that Scripture, as a whole, is God's *one perfect* and *complete* instrument, giving forth to those, who wish to learn, its one saving music from many notes combined, stilling and restraining all stirrings of the evil one, as David's music in Saul's madness."—

εἶναι τῷ τῆς ἑτέρας ἀποτελεῖ νομίζονται τῷ ἀμούσῳ καὶ μὴ ἐπισταμένῳ λόγον μουσικῆς συμφωνίας διὰ τὴν ἀνομοιότητα τῶν φθόγγων ἀσύμφωνοι τυγχάνειν· οὕτως οἱ μὴ ἐπιστάμενοι ἀκούειν τῆς τοῦ Θεοῦ ἐν ταῖς ἱεραῖς γραφαῖς ἁρμονίας, οἴονται ἀνάρμοστον εἶναι τῇ καινῇ τὴν παλαιὰν, ἢ τῷ νόμῳ τοὺς προφήτας, ἢ τὰ εὐαγγέλια ἀλλήλοις, ἢ τὸν ἀπόστολον τῷ εὐαγγελίῳ, ἢ ἑαυτῷ, ἢ τοῖς ἀποστόλοις. ἀλλ' ἐλθὼν ὁ πεπαιδευμένος τὴν του Θεοῦ μουσικὴν, σοφός τις ἐν ἔργοις καὶ λόγοις τυγχάνων, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο χρηματίζων ἂν Δαβὶδ, ὃς ἑρμενεύεται ἱκανὸς χειρὶ, ἀποτελέσει φθογγὸν μουσικῆς Θεοῦ, ἀπὸ ταύτης μαθὼν ἐν καιρῷ κρούειν χορδὰς, νῦν μὲν νομικὰς, νῦν δὲ συμφώνους αὐταῖς εὐαγγελικάς· καὶ νυνὶ μὲν προφητικὰς, ὅτε δὲ εὔλογον ἀπαιτεῖ, τὰς ὁμοτόνους αὐταῖς ἀποστολικὰς, οὕτω δὲ καὶ ἀποστολικὰς εὐαγγελικαῖς. ἓν γὰρ τὸ τέλειον οἶδε καὶ ἡρμοσμένον ὄργανον τοῦ Θεοῦ εἶναι πᾶσαν τὴν γραφὴν, μίαν ἀποτελοῦν ἐκ διαφόρων φθόγγων σωτήριον τοῖς μανθάνειν ἐθέλουσι φωνὴν, καταπαύουσαν καὶ κωλύουσαν ἐνέργειαν πᾶσαν πονηροῦ πνεύματος, ὡς κατέπαυσεν ἡ Δαβὶδ μουσικὴ τὸ ἐν τῷ Σαοὺλ πονηρὸν πνεῦμα καὶ πνίγον αὐτὸν.—
Origen, Comment. in Matt. p. 441, Tom. iii. ed. Ben.

Could such a testimony to the completeness of Scripture have proceeded from one who held that only part of the Faith was to be found in Scripture, and part in unwritten tradition? And again; "the two Testaments in which every word appertaining to God may be sought and discussed, and out of them all knowledge of things may be apprehended. But if any thing shall remain over and above what holy Scripture determines, no other third scripture ought to be received for the purpose of giving an authority to any knowledge.....but we must commit to the fire what remains, that is, reserve it unto God[1]."

Cent. 2. 190. *Clement of Alexandria*[2]; "Men, who deal in matters of the highest importance, must

---

[1] "Duo testamenta ..... in quibus liceat omne verbum quod ad Deum pertinet (hoc enim est sacrificium) requiri et discuti, atque ex ipsis omnem rerum scientiam capi. Si quid autem superfuerit, quod non divina Scriptura decernat, nullam aliam tertiam scripturam debere ad auctoritatem scientiæ suscipi ..... sed igni tradamus quod superest, id est Deo reservemus.—Orig. Hom. V. § 9. in Levit. Tom. ii. p. 212, ed. Bened.

[2] Σφάλλεσθαι γὰρ ἀνάγκη μέγιστα τοὺς μεγίστοις ἐγχειροῦντας πράγμασιν, ἢν μὴ τὸν κανόνα τῆς ἀληθείας παρ' αὐτῆς λαβόντες ἔχωσι τῆς ἀληθείας· οἱ τοιοῦτοι δὲ, ἅτε ἀποπεσόντες τῆς ὀρθῆς ὁδοῦ, καὶ τοῖς πλείστοις τῶν κατὰ μέρος σφάλλονται· εἰκότως, διὰ τὸ μὴ ἔχειν ἀληθῶν καὶ ψευδῶν κριτήριον, συγγεγυμνασμένον ἀκριβῶς τὰ δέοντα αἱρεῖσθαι. εἰ γὰρ ἐκέκτηντο, ταῖς θείαις ἐπείθοντο ἂν γραφαῖς. καθάπερ οὖν εἴτις ἐξ ἀνθρώπων θηρίον γένοιτο παραπλησίως τοῖς ὑπὸ τῆς Κήρκης φαρμαχθεῖσιν, οὕτως ἄνθρωπος εἶναι τοῦ Θεοῦ καὶ πιστὸς τῷ Κυρίῳ διαμένειν ἀπολώ-

needs commit great errors, if they do not take and hold the *rule of faith* from truth itself. For such men, having once deviated from the right way, do likewise err in most particulars: probably because they have not the faculty of distinguishing truths and falsehoods, perfectly exercised to choose what ought to be chosen. For if they had this, they would be *ruled* by the divine *Scriptures*. Therefore he hath ceased to be a man of God and faithful to the Lord, who hath kicked against tradition ecclesiastical, and hath turned to the opinions of human sects. But he who returning out of error obeys the Scriptures, and hath conformed his life to the truth, he is, of a man, as it were made a god."—Hence it is plain, *where* he thought the "tradition ecclesiastical," i. e. the doctrine revealed by God, and preached in the the Church to all men, was to be found. But he continues: "For this Scripture we use for the

---

λεκεν, ὁ ἀναλακτίσας τὴν Ἐκκλησιαστικὴν παράδοσιν, καὶ ἀποκιρτήσας εἰς δόξας αἱρέσεων ἀνθρωπίνων· ὁ δὲ ἐκ τήσδε τῆς ἀπάτης παλινδρομήσας, κατακούσας τῶν γραφῶν, καὶ τὸν ἑαυτοῦ βίον ἐπιστρέψας τῇ ἀληθείᾳ, οἷον ἐξ ἀνθρώπου Θεὸς ἀποτελεῖται ..... ἀμέλει πρὸς τὴν τῶν πραγμάτων εὕρεσιν, αὐτῇ χρώμεθα κριτηρίῳ· ..... εἰ δ' οὐκ ἀρκεῖ μόνον ἁπλῶς εἴπειν τὸ δόξαν, ἀλλὰ πιστώσασθαι δεῖ τὸ λεχθὲν, οὐ τὴν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων ἀναμένομεν μαρτυρίαν, ἀλλὰ τῇ τοῦ Κυρίου φωνῇ πιστούμεθα τὸ ζητούμενον· ἢ πασῶν ἀποδείξεων ἐχεγγυώτερα, μᾶλλον δὲ, ἡ μόνη ἀπόδειξις οὖσα τυγχάνει· καθ' ἣν ἐπιστήμην οἱ μὲν ἀπογευσάμενοι μόνον τῶν γραφῶν, πιστοί.—Clement. Alex. Strom. Lib. VII. p. 890, ed. Potteri.

finding out of things, *this* we use as the *rule of judging*.....But if it be not enough to speak our opinions absolutely, but that we must prove what we say, we expect no testimony that is given by men, but by the voice of the Lord we *prove* the question: and this is more worthy of belief than any demonstration; or rather it is the only demonstration, by which knowledge they who have tasted of the Scriptures alone, are faithful." Thus he goes on for several pages together. Here, then, besides a direct testimony to the sufficiency of the Scriptures, we have an assertion that they are the criterion,—the rule of judging in controversies of faith; that the tradition, or belief constantly held by the Church is to be found in them; and that therefore they are the plenary repository of the doctrine delivered by Christ and his Apostles. And we have these explicit and catholic statements from the pen of a man, who is the earliest Christian author in whose writings allusion is made to the *disciplina arcani;* and in the very work too, from which the Romish cause has been thought to gain no small advantage, on account of this learned man's having therein stated, that there were certain doctrines intended for and suited solely to the γνωστικὸς—as distinguished from the bulk of believers, and which had been conveyed from Christ and the Apostles down to his own times by oral tradition.

The ORIENTAL CHURCHES held the same doctrine. THE ORIENTAL CHURCHES.

446. *Theodoret,* Bishop of Cyrus in Syria, in this year wrote his Eranistes. In the second of the three dialogues, of which it is mainly composed, he proves that—however an indiscreet friendship might have prompted him hitherto to espouse the cause of Nestorius—his own tenets were perfectly catholic; (to use his own words in the preface to his Eranistes) that he guarded safely what the Apostles preached[1]. But, what is more to our present purpose, he proves likewise that he knew what was the final standard of appeal which ought to be decisive to the Christian enquirer. His words are[2]: "How else can one dispute with those who deny that Christ assumed flesh or human soul or mind, except by proofs of these adduced from divine Cent. 5.

[1] Indeed it appears, that he had not hitherto fully understood the case; for when he afterwards took his seat at the Synod of Chalcedon, Cave says that he "fidem Catholicam diserte professus, Nestorium vero damnare diu tergiversatus. Sessione demum octavâ causa ejus *plenius cognita est;* et post anathema Nestorio incussum," &c. Hist. Litt. Vol. i. in v. "Theodoritus."

[2] Πῶς γὰρ ἄν τις ἑτέρως διαλεχθείη τοῖς τῆς σαρκὸς, ἢ τῆς ψυχῆς, ἢ τοῦ νοῦ τὴν ἀνάληψιν ἀρνουμένοις, εἰ μὴ τὰς περὶ τούτων ἀποδείξεις ἀπὸ τῆς θείας προφέρων γραφῆς; πῶς δὲ ἄν τις τοὺς τοῦ Μονογενοῦς τὴν θεότητα σμικρύνειν φιλονεικοῦντας διελέγξαι λυττῶντας, ἢ τὰ μὲν θεολογικῶς, τὰ δὲ οἰκονομικῶς δεικνὺς εἰρηκυῖαν τὴν θείαν γραφήν; Dial. II. Inconfusus, p. 113. Tom. iv. ed. Sirmond. But the first half of the dialogue is one continued proof of the doctrines in debate from Scripture.

Scripture! how refute the phrenzied men who strive to disparage the divinity of the Only-begotten, unless by shewing that Holy Scripture has spoken some things with reference to his divine, others with reference to his human nature?" In the third Dialogue, after Orthodox has stated the catholic doctrine of the Passion and Resurrection, Eranistes answers[1]; "The doctrines of the Church should be set forth not in declaration merely, but by *proof*. Shew me, then, that *Holy Scripture* teaches this." Upon which Orthodox proceeds to cite the Epistle to the Romans. He here clearly looks upon the Bible as *the proof*, the only absolutely authoritative ultimate standard of appeal. Just as in the first of the three dialogues, when Eranistes—the heterodox disputant—after hearing his proofs from Scripture, had said; "Your explanation of this has an air of great probability. But I would learn, how the ancient doctors of the Church understood these words": Orthodox is made to reply[2]; "You ought to have been satisfied by these proofs from the Apostles and Prophets. Since, however, you ask likewise for the explan-

---

[1] Ἀποδεικτικῶς, οὐκ ἀποφαντικῶς, χρὴ λέγειν τῆς ἐκκλησίας τὰ δόγματα, δεῖξον τοίνυν ταῦτα διδάσκουσαν τὴν θείαν γραφήν. Dial. III. Impatibilis, p. 199.

[2] Ἔδει μέν σε πεισθῆναι ταῖς ἀποστολικαῖς καὶ προφητικαῖς ἀποδείξεσιν. ἐπειδὴ δὲ καὶ τὰς τῶν ἁγίων πατέρων ἑρμηνείας ἐπιζητεῖς, ἐγώ σοι καὶ ταύτην, σὺν Θεῷ φάναι, προσοίσω τὴν θεραπείαν. Dial. II. Immutabilis, p. 43.

ations of the holy Fathers; this medicine, too—with God's help—I will administer to you" (in allusion to the disease of heresy under which he was labouring). On which passage Mr Newman observes; "as if he said, it is not now the place for bringing mere authority; I am *proving* the doctrine. Authority is well in its place, viz. before the controversy; but now our buisness is with Scripture[3]."

395. *St John Chrysostom* while a presbyter of the Church at Antioch[4] wrote, among very many other books, his Homilies on the Gospels of St Matthew and St John; to the latter of which we shall refer. But there is also another work not finished, consisting of 54 homilies on St Matthew; in one of which Cave complains, that the editors—under pretence of purifyng them of certain interpolations said to have been made by some favourers of Arianism—have cut out a famous passage (locus ille πολλυθρύλλητος) often advanced against the Romanists concerning holy Scripture. But in another upon the parable of the marriage supper, in chapter xxii, our author having explained[5] that "by Cent. 4.

---

[3] Office of the Church, p. 390.

[4] *i. e.* between the years 386—397. See Cave, Hist. Litt. tom. i. pp. 175, 183.

[5] "Prandium enim est doctrina justitiæ, et verba cælestium mysteriorum de Filio Dei venturo. Quæ omnia mandens homo, id est, audiens, acquirit sibi vitam æternam. Multas

the supper we are to understand the doctrine of righteousness, which a man by eating—that is, hearing—obtains eternal life;" he thus continues: 'And all things are now ready.' Whatever is requisite for salvation, is now filled full in the Scriptures.....There is therefore in this feast nothing less than what is *necessary to the salvation* of mankind."

In the 58th of the latter, commenting on John x. 1, he writes[1]: "Behold the evidences of a robber;

---

enim proprietates habet sermo ad escam.....Qui autem manducat de spirituali convivio, impletur spiritu, dilatatur sensibus, nutritur in veritate, pinguescit in fide, et sic ingreditur ad interiora voluntatis Dei, et manens in eis acquirit sibi vitam æternam.....Sicut enim regale prandium multis ciborum speciebus ornatur, ita et hoc convivium scripturarum diversis justitiarum speciebus est decoratum.....*Et omnia jam parata.* Quicquid quæritur ad salutem, totum jam adimpletum est in scripturis. Qui ignarus est, inveniet ibi quod discat. Qui contumax est et peccator, inveniet ibi futuri judicii flagella, quæ timeat. Qui laborat, inveniet ibi glorias et promissiones vitæ perpetuæ, quas manducando amplius excitetur ad opus. Qui pusillanimis est et infirmus, inveniet ibi mediocres justitiæ cibos, qui etsi pinguem animam non faciunt, tamen mori non permittunt. Qui magnanimus est et fidelis, inveniet ibi spirituales escas continentioris vitæ, quæ perducant eum prope ad angelorum naturam. Qui percussus a diabolo et vulneratus est in peccatis, inveniet medicinales cibos, qui eum per pœnitentiam revocent ad salutem.....Nihil ergo minus est in hoc convivio, quam quod necessarium habet salus humana."—S. Chrysost. in cap. Matt. xxii. Homil. XLI. p. 112. Comment. in N. T. tom. ii. ed. Ducæi. 1697.

[1] Ὅρα τὰ δείγματα τοῦ λῃστοῦ· πρῶτον, ὅτι οὐ παῤῥησίᾳ εἰσέρχεται· δεύτερον, ὅτι οὐ κατὰ τὰς Γραφάς· τοῦτο γάρ ἐστι τὸ,

first that he enters not openly; next, that he enters not by the Scriptures, for this is meant by not entering in at the door.....He suitably calls the Scriptures the door; for they bring us to God, and open upon us the knowledge of Him. These make the sheep, these same guard them, and fence off the wolves. Scripture, like a secure door, puts a bar to the entrance of heretics; placing us in security concerning all we may desire, and not suffering us to be deceived: and if we do not throw this door open, we shall not easily fall a prey to the enemies. *By this* shall we know of all, *whether they be true or false shepherds.*" And once more in another homily[2]. "But if we have the faculties of our

---

Μὴ διὰ τῆς θύρας.....Εἰκότως δὲ θύραν τὰς Γραφὰς ἐκάλεσεν. Αὗται γὰρ ἡμᾶς προσάγουσι τῷ Θεῷ, καὶ τὴν θεογνωσίαν ἀνοίγουσιν. αὗται πρόβατα ποιοῦσιν, αὗται φυλάττουσι, καὶ τοὺς λύκους οὐκ ἀφιᾶσιν ἐπεισελθεῖν. Καθάπερ γάρ τις θύρα ἀσφαλὴς, οὕτως ἀποκλείει τοῖς αἱρετικοῖς τὴν εἴσοδον, ἐν ἀσφαλείᾳ καθιστῶσα ἡμᾶς περὶ ὧν ἂν βουλώμεθα πάντων, καὶ οὐκ ἐῶσα πλανᾶσθαι. Κἂν μὴ παραλύσωμεν αὐτὴν, οὐκ ἐσόμεθα εὐχείρωτοι τοῖς ἐχθροῖς. Διὰ ταύτης καὶ τοὺς ποιμένας καὶ τοὺς οὐ ποιμένας εἰσόμεθα ἅπαντας.—S. Chrysost. in Joan. Homil. LIX. al. LVIII. p. 346. tom. viii. ed. Ben.

[2] Ἀλλ' ἐὰν ἔχωμεν τὰ αἰσθητήρια τῆς ψυχῆς γεγυμνασμένα πρὸς διάκρισιν καλοῦ τε καὶ κακοῦ, δυνησόμεθα τοὺς τοιούτους διακρίνειν. Πῶς δὲ γεγυμνασμένα γίνεται ἡμῶν τὰ αἰσθητήρια; ἀπὸ τῆς συνεχοῦς ἀκροάσεως, ἀπὸ τῆς τῶν Γραφῶν ἐμπειρίας..... Ἡμεῖς δὲ διὰ τοῦτο τὴν πίστιν παρελάβομεν ἁπλῶς, ἵνα μὴ ἀναγκαζώμεθα μυρίαις ἐπιέναι αἱρέσεσι, καὶ πράγματα ἔχειν, ἀλλ' ὅπερ ἂν ᾖ προσθεῖναι ἢ ἀφελεῖν τις ἐπιχειρήσειεν ἐκείνης, τοῦτο

minds trained to distinguish between good and evil, we shall be able to detect such men (heretics). But how are we to train our faculties? By a continual hearing and an intimate knowledge *of the Scriptures*.....To this end we have received *the Faith*, that we might not be compelled to give in to, and be troubled with, innumerable heresies; but that whatever any one shall add or subtract from it, that we may know at once to be spurious. For just as those who give rules, do not necessitate people to bother themselves with innumerable measures, but bid them keep to the one given rule; so is it with theological doctrines. Yet no one will give his attention to the Scriptures! for if we were in the habit of attending to them, not only should we not fall into error ourselves, but we could free others from their error and extricate them from their danger."—He then relates the history of the giving and preservation of the Scriptures, and quotes several texts in proof of their design and

---

νόθον εἶναι νομίσωμεν. Καθάπερ γὰρ οἱ τοὺς κανόνας διδόντες οὐκ ἀναγκάζουσι μυρία μέτρα περιεργάζεσθαι, ἀλλὰ τὸ δοθὲν ἐκεῖνο κατέχειν κελεύουσιν· οὕτω καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν δογμάτων. Ἀλλ' οὐδεὶς βούλεται ταῖς Γραφαῖς προσέχειν· εἰ γὰρ προσείχομεν, οὐ μόνον οὐκ ἂν περιεπέσομεν τῇ ἀπάτῃ, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἑτέρους ἀπατωμένους ἀπηλλάξαμεν ἄν, καὶ τῶν κινδύνων ἐξειλκύσαμεν..... Διά τοι τοῦτο οὐδὲν ὑγιὲς, οὐδὲν χρήσιμον παρ' ἡμῶν γίνεται.—Idem. in Epist. ad Heb. cap. v. Homil. VIII. pp. 89, 90. tom. xii. ed. Ben.

value; and after deploring the ignorance of holy writ displayed by the people of Antioch[1], he concludes with "Verily this is the cause why nothing sound, nothing useful is found among us." Here, then, are the Scriptures mentioned—and this too, without a shadow of a suspicion that the fact could possibly be denied—as that in which the Faith is contained; the one given rule, whereby to distinguish heresy and truth. And if so, the *whole* Faith; for if not, the rest would be imperfect, and the result would be the admission of error for some particular portion of the truth. Now, that which contains the test of truth perfect and entire, cannot but 'contain sufficiently all doctrines required of necessity for eternal salvation.'

370. *Gregory*, Bishop of *Nyssa*[2]; "Forasmuch as this is upholden with no testimony of Scripture we will reject it as false."

---

[1] I have said "of Antioch," because though it is generally agreed that the homilies on St Paul's Epistles were preached after Chrysostom had been advanced to the episcopal office, still (as Cave remarks from Savile) not a few seem to have been delivered while he was yet a presbyter at Antioch. And that this was one of the latter, is not altogether improbable, when we recollect the notice prefixed to the set on the Epistle to the Hebrews—Ἑρμηνεία εἰς τὴν πρὸς Ἑβραίους Ἐπιστολὴν, ἐκτεθεῖσα ἀπὸ σημείων μετὰ τὴν κοίμησιν αὐτοῦ, παρὰ Κωνσταντίνου πρεσβυτέρου Ἀντιοχείας.

[2] "Quum id nullo scripturæ testimonio fultum sit, ut falsum improbabimus." S. Greg. Nys. Lib. de Cognit. Dei, cit. ab Euthymio in Panoplia, pars I. tit. viii. note 4.

About the same period his brother, ***Basil the Great,*** writes[1] —"It is a manifest defection from the faith, and a plain proof of pride, either to reject any point of what is written, or to introduce any of those things that are not written." And in another place he teaches[2], that "a faithful man ought not to dare either to reject or to add any thing to holy Scripture. For if 'whatsoever is not of faith be sin' (as the Apostle saith,) and 'faith is by hearing, and hearing by the word of God'; then whatsoever is without the holy Scripture, being not of faith, must needs be sin." How little notion, then, had the saint-like bishop of Cesaræa of any "word of God" besides and except the *written* word!

347. In this year *Cyril of Jerusalem* delivered in the Basilica of Constantine some lectures to the candidates for Baptism. In one of these, having promised that the heads of doctrine which he had just delivered summarily to the catechumens, should be afterwards set forth more largely

---

[1] Φανερὰ ἔκπτωσις πίστεως καὶ ὑπερηφανίας κατηγορία, ἢ ἀθετεῖν τι τῶν γεγραμμένων, ἢ ἐπεισάγειν τῶν μὴ γεγραμμένων. S. Basil. De Fide, Sect. i. fin. tom. ii. p. 224, ed. Ben.

[2] Καὶ μηδὲν τολμᾷν ἀθετεῖν ἢ ἐπίδια πάσσεσθαι. Εἰ γὰρ πᾶν, ὃ οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως, ἁμαρτία ἐστὶν—ὥς φησιν ὁ ἀπόστολος, ἡ δὲ πίστις ἐξ ἀκοῆς, ἡ δὲ ἀκοὴ διὰ ῥήματος Θεοῦ· πᾶν τὸ ἐκτὸς τῆς θεοπνεύστου γραφῆς, οὐκ ἐκ πίστεως ὄν, ἁμαρτία ἐστίν.—In Ethicis, Regul. LXXX. c. 22.

with Scripture proofs, he proceeds[3]; "For touching the sacred mysteries of the Faith, not even a casual remark should be delivered without the warrant of the divine Scriptures.....Give then no credence to my words, except you receive from Scripture the proof of what is set forth; for this is the security of our faith, its being delivered, not from ingenious reasonings, but from demonstration of holy Scripture."

325. *Eusebius,* the historian, writing from the Synod of Nice to his diocese, gives an account of the symbol of faith which he was commissioned to draw up; which he prefaces thus[4]: "As we have received from our predecessors the Bishops then, when we were instructed in the first principles of the faith and received the laver of

---

[3] Δεῖ γὰρ περὶ τῶν θείων καὶ ἁγίων τῆς Πίστεως μυστηρίων, μηδὲ τὸ τυχὸν ἄνευ τῶν θείων παραδίδοσθαι γραφῶν'.....μηδὲ ἐμοὶ τῷ ταῦτά σοι λέγοντι ἁπλῶς πιστεύσῃς, ἐὰν τὴν ἀπόδειξιν τῶν καταγγελλομένων ἀπὸ τῶν θείων μὴ λάβῃς γραφῶν· ἡ σωτηρία γὰρ αὕτη τῆς πίστεως ἡμῶν, οὐκ ἐξ εὑρεσιλογίας, ἀλλὰ ἐξ ἀποδείξεως τῶν θείων ἐστὶ γραφῶν.—S. Cyrilli Cateches. IV. De decem dogmat. § xvii. p. 60. ed. Ben.

[4] Ἡ Ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἐκτεθεῖσα πίστις.—Καθὼς παρελάβομεν παρὰ τῶν πρὸ ἡμῶν ἐπισκόπων, ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ κατηχήσει καὶ ὅτε τὸ λουτρὸν ἐλαμβάνομεν, καθὼς καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν θείων γραφῶν μεμαθήκαμεν, καὶ ὡς ἐν αὐτῷ τῷ πρεσβυτερίῳ καὶ ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ ἐπισκοπῇ ἐπιστεύομέν τε καὶ ἐδιδάσκομεν, οὕτω καὶ νῦν πιστεύοντες τὴν ἡμετέραν πιστὶν προσαναφέρομεν. ἔστι δὲ αὕτη. ΠΙΣΤΕΥΟΜΕΝ, κ. τ. λ.—B. Theodor. Eccles. Hist. Lib. I. c. xi. p. 776. Tom. iii. ed. Sirmond.

Baptism; as, too, we have learned from the divine Scriptures;.....so also we do now believe and do make a public declaration of this our faith."—This passage is the more remarkable, because the Bishop is giving an account of their proceedings at the Synod, and of the grounds upon which they came to a decision. *Scripture*, he tells them, was the final *standard;* but for the right *interpretation* of it, they each bore his testimony as to what he had been taught when first instructed in the principles of religion: and what so many independent witnesses from all parts of Christendom agreed in, that they knew must be the truth[1].—

[1] Thus we are told, that "when, at the commencement of the session, the logicians began to discuss and dispute, they were immediately put to silence;—the Fathers had come, not to debate about the faith, but to *bear testimony*."—See Maimbourg's Hist. Arian. (quoted in Dr Hook's Sermons before the University, p. 110.), who shews that the orthodox desired to keep to the tradition they had received, "without endeavouring to give new *turns* to the words of Scripture." But the Arians, unable to find in it what they maintained, "desired that the truth of their doctrine might be sought from Scripture alone, which they could wrest to their own sense by their false subtleties." Which very circumstance clearly proves that no such tradition independent of Scripture could have then been thought to exist; else the Arians would at once have claimed that in support of their doctrine. This was the first œcumenical synod; in the five succeeding ones the same mode of determining the Faith was resorted to; and in not one of the five do we find any *tradition independent* of, and supplementary to, Scripture laid claim to by any party.

So different is the real catholic subordinate tradition from the suppletory tradition of the single Bishop of Rome!

In connexion with this we may refer to the speech of the emperor Constantine the Great, to the Fathers assembled at Nice. He exhorts them to peace and harmony while debating matters of so holy a nature. And what was it, which was to produce concord and silence every disputatious tongue, as the ultimate resort, decisive and admitting no appeal?—the teaching of the Holy Spirit *committed to writing*. The historian's words are these[2]: "especially (they should agree among themselves,) since they were debating on divine subjects, and had the doctrine of the most holy Spirit committed to writing. 'For'—said he—'the evangelical and apostolical books, and the oracles of the ancient Prophets, do clearly teach us whatsoever we ought to believe concerning the Divine will. Laying aside therefore all bitterness and strife, let us take the solution of those things which are questioned out of the inspired writings'."

---

[2] Ἄλλως τε καὶ περὶ θείων διαλεγομένους πραγμάτων, καὶ τοῦ παναγίου Πνεύματος τὴν διδασκαλίαν ἀνάγραπτον ἔχοντας. εὐαγγελικαὶ γὰρ, φησὶ, βίβλοι καὶ ἀποστολικαὶ, καὶ τῶν παλαιῶν προφητῶν θεσπίσματα, σαφῶς ἡμᾶς ἃ χρὴ περὶ τοῦ θείου φρονεῖν ἐκπαιδεύουσι. τὴν πολεμοποιὸν οὖν ἀπελάσαντες ἔριν, ἐκ τῶν θεοπνεύστων λόγων λάβωμεν τῶν ζητουμένων τὴν λύσιν.—B. Theodor. Eccles. Hist. Lib. I. c. vi. p. 757. Theodoret wrote his History in the year 450, according to Cave.

Cent. 2.

140. *Justin the Martyr*, in arguing a point with Trypho, who pretended to have a Jewish tradition in his favour, stops him with—"Hearken to what I shall recite out of the holy Scriptures;—proofs which need not to be explained, but merely to be heard." This passage may not, perhaps, be exactly to our purpose, since he was arguing with a Jew, and not with a person who had been baptised into the "Apostles' doctrine and fellowship;" yet it shews, that Justin deemed Scripture to be both sufficiently plain and the proper instrument for determining controversies: and if so, it must contain sufficiently all essential doctrine[1].

The Western Churches.

Thus with one voice speak the pastors of the Christian flocks in the East and in the South; and if we now visit the WESTERN DOCTORS, we shall hear them giving their evidence, diverse indeed in language, but identical in spirit[2].

---

[1] I have not met with the original of the passage cited in the text, in any part of Justin's Dialogue which I have yet read; and Abp. Tillotson, from whom the quotation is borrowed, does not give any clue by which to turn to it. However, it requires but a small acquaintance with the writings of this champion of the Christian faith, to be satisfied of the estimation in which he must have held holy Scripture; though—from causes alluded to, at the beginning of this chapter—he has not, perhaps, made any so express assertion on the point, as we catholics at this day might wish for.

[2] Cf. B. Theodoret. Eranist. Dial. I. Tom. iv. p. 44.—Ἐπειδή σοι τοὺς τὰ νότια καὶ βόρεια ποιμάναντας συμφωνοῦντας ἐδείξαμεν,

444. *Prosper*, the notary to Pope Leo[3], as cited by Bishop Jeremy Taylor[4] says: "If the Scriptures are silent, who will speak?" But the doctrine of the Western Church in the 5th century rests not on the authority of a layman, for much about the same time flourished no less a person than the great pillar of catholicity,

Vincentius of Lerins. In the opening of his Commonitorium he thus speaks[5]:—"I have made

---

δεῦρο δή σε καὶ πρὸς τοὺς ἀοιδίμους τῆς ἑσπερίας ξεναγήσωμεν διδασκάλους, οἳ γλώττῃ μὲν ἑτέρᾳ, διανοίᾳ δὲ οὐχ ἑτέρᾳ, τὴν ἑρμηνείαν συνέγραψαν.

[3] If, as Vossius thinks, (see Cave H. L.) the book De Vocatione Gentium—from which this passage is taken—should be ascribed to the Bishop of Orleans of the same name, it is only bringing the *Catena* down a century lower.

[4] Works, vol. x. p. 412.

[5] Sæpe igitur magno studio, et summa attentione perquirens a quam plurimis sanctitate et doctrina præstantibus viris, quonam modo possim certa quadam, et quasi generali ac regulari via catholicæ fidei veritatem ab hæreticæ pravitatis falsitate discernere: hujusmodi semper responsum ab omnibus fere retuli:—quod sive ego, sive quis alius vellet exsurgentium hæreticorum fraudes deprehendere, laqueosque vitare, et in fide sana sanus atque integer permanere; duplici modo munire fidem suam—Domino adjuvante—deberet: primum scilicet *divinæ legis auctoritate;* tum deinde *ecclesiæ catholicæ traditione.* Hic forsitan requirat aliquis: Quum sit perfectus Scripturarum canon, sibique ad omnia satis superque sufficiat; quid opus est, ut ei ecclesiasticæ intelligentiæ jungatur auctoritas? Quia videlicet scripturam sacram, pro ipsa sua altitudine, non uno eodemque sensu universi accipiunt: sed ejusdem eloquia aliter atque aliter, alius atque

frequent enquiries, and that with much earnestness and anxiety, of a great number of holy and learned men, for some definite and general rule for discriminating the truth of the catholic faith from the falsity of heretical pravity; and have always received—I may say from all—an answer such as this: .....to fortify my faith in two ways,.....FIRST, by the authority of the *Divine Law;* NEXT, by the *tradition* of the Catholic Church. Here some one may ask, since the canon of the Scriptures is *perfect*, and *sufficient*, and more than sufficient in itself for all purposes, what is the need of joining to it the authority of the ecclesiastical sense? I answer, because the depth of holy Scripture is such, that all do not take it in one and the same sense: but its statements are interpreted variously by various persons, so that as many senses seem deducible from it, as there are men to read it..... On this account, it is very necessary, such complicated and various error abounding, to regulate the *interpretation* of Prophets and Apostles by the standard of the ecclesiastical and catholic sense." This noble passage has the double advantage, first,

---

alius interpretatur; ut pœne, quot homines sunt, tot illinc sententiæ erui posse videantur.....Atque idcirco multum necesse est, propter tantos tam varii erroris anfractus, ut propheticæ et apostolicæ interpretationis linea, secundum ecclesiastici et catholici sensus normam dirigatur."—S. Vincentii Lerinens. Common. Capp. i. et ii.

of witnessing to the sufficiency of Scripture, by *directly* asserting it; and secondly, of shewing what was then understood by tradition;—not that it was an independent witness of Christian truth,—nor a suppletory body of doctrine; but merely *subordinate to* and *interpretative of* Holy Writ. And this it does in the most satisfactory way,—by specifying the sole cause from which the *need* of tradition arose,—viz. "the depth of Scripture," which therefore required a fixed rule of *interpretation.* The only question with which the Monk of Lerins was engaged, was the interpretation of Scripture; and he submits to catholic tradition only as subservient to this. He assumes as undeniable, the very doctrine rejected now by Romanists, the sole supremacy of Scripture.

From Gaul let us turn our eyes Southwards, and hear the famous Bishop of Hippo.

About

397. *St Augustine,* in a work directed against the Donatist Petilian, thus writes[1]: "If any one in matters relating to Christ or his Church, or any Cent. 4.

---

[1] "Proinde sive de Christo, sive de ejus Ecclesia, sive de quacumque alia re quæ pertinet ad fidem vitamque vestram, non dicam nos, nequaquam comparandi ei qui dixit —*Licet si nos;* sed omnino quod secutus adjecit, *Si angelus de cœlo vobis annuntiaverit præter quam quod* in Scripturis legalibus et evangelicis *accepistis, anathema sit.*"—S. August. cont. Litt. Petil. Lib. III. § vii. Tom. ix. p. 301. ed. Ben.

other thing which appertains to faith or life,—I will not say, if we, as though I would compare myself with St Paul; but (what he has added)—'if an angel from heaven shall preach unto you aught besides[1] what ye have received in the Legal and Evangelical Scriptures, let him be accursed.'" Again, in another work against the Donatists, among many passages to the same effect, we may select the following[2]: "All such like things being removed, let them demonstrate their church, if they can,—not by the sermons and rumours of the Africans, not by the synods of their bishops, not by the letters of any disputers, not by signs and deceitful miracles; because against these things we are warned and prepared by the word of the Lord,—but by the prescript of the Law, of the Prophets, of the Psalms, of the Evangelists, and all

---

[1] Bellarmine and some other Romanists, in answer, translate præterquam *against*, as if it were præter. See Bp. Taylor's Dissuasive, Works, vol. x. p. 409. ed. Heber, who refutes this at length.

[2] "Remotis ergo omnibus talibus Ecclesiam suam demonstrent, si possunt, non in sermonibus et rumoribus Afrorum, non in conciliis episcoporum suorum, non in litteris quorumdam disputatorum, non in signis et prodigiis fallacibus, quia etiam contra ista verbo Domini præparati et cauti redditi sumus: sed in præscripto Legis, in Prophetarum prædictis, in Psalmorum cantibus, in ipsius unius Pastoris vocibus, in Evangelistarum prædicationibus et laboribus, hoc est, in omnibus canonicis sanctorum Librorum auctoritatibus."—Idem, De Unitate Eccles. § 47. Tom. ix. p. 371. ed. Ben.

canonical authorities of the holy books." Clearly, then, he deemed the Canonical Scriptures sufficient. But to place this beyond a doubt, we hear him, in another entirely distinct work, saying[3]: "In those things which are clearly placed in Scripture, are to be found all which comprise the faith and rules of life."

378. *St Jerome*, one of the most learned of the fathers, is very express on this point: indeed he seems to have sometimes gone to as great lengths as Tertullian did, who is known to have been almost fanatical in his reverence for Scripture[4]. Two or three passages may be selected out of a multitude.—"Every word which we utter, we ought to corroborate by holy Scripture; for in the mouth of two or three witnesses shall every word

---

[3] "In iis quæ aperte in Scripturis posita sunt, inveniuntur illa omnia quæ continent fidem moresque vivendi."—De doctrina Christ. L. II. c. ix. p. 24. Tom. iii.

[4] See Bp. Kaye's Tertullian, p. 290.—One of Tertullian's principles which he gravely lays down (de Monogam. c. iv. p. 140. T. iii. ed. Semler), was "negat scriptura quod non notat;" a principle which St Jerome would seem to have acknowledged, when he assigned his reason for believing the perpetual virginity of the mother of God manifest in the flesh:—"that God was born of a virgin, we believe because we read it: that Mary did marry after her delivery, we do not believe because we read it not."—(Adv. Helvid. Opp. Tom. iv. pars ii. p. 141. ed. Ben.)

be established[1]."—Again[2], "If, according to St Paul, Christ is 'the power of God, and the wisdom of God'; and if he who knows not the Scriptures, knows not the power and the wisdom of God; ignorance of the Scriptures must be ignorance of Christ." Once more[3]: "Those other things which they invent and forge at will, *as if from some tradition of the Apostles, without the authority and testimonies of the Scriptures*, the sword of God smites."

360. *Optatus*, a Christian Bishop in the same quarter of the world as Austin, in 'this pregnant place' (as Archbishop Laud justly styles it) thus argues against the repetition of Baptism[4]. "You

---

[1] "Omne quod loquimur, debemus affirmare de Scripturis sanctis—in ore enim duorum et trium testium stabit omne verbum. Non habet tantam auctoritatem sermo dicentis quantum Domini præceptum."—Hieron. in Psal. xcviii.

[2] "Si enim juxta Apostolum Paulum, Christus Dei virtus est Deique sapientia; et qui nescit Scripturas nescit Dei virtutem ejusque sapientiam; ignoratio Scripturarum ignoratio Christi est."—Idem, Comment. in Esai. Lib. I. Procem. p. 3. Tom. v. ed. Basil. 1565.

[3] "Sed et alia quæ, absque auctoritate et testimoniis Scripturarum, quasi traditione Apostolica sponte reperiunt atque confingunt, percutit gladius Dei."—Idem, In Aggeum, c. i. § 11.

[4] "Cujus de sacramento non leve certamen innatum est, et dubitatur, an post Trinitatem in eadem Trinitate hoc iterum liceat facere. Vos dicitis, licet; nos dicimus, non licet: inter licet vestrum, et non licet nostrum, nutant et

say it may be repeated, we say it may not; the minds of our people fluctuate between the two. Let no one trust you, or us either; we are all of us party men. Arbiters must be found; but if they be Christians, such are not fairly producible on either side, for truth suffers by our private prejudices: we must seek for an arbiter out of doors. If he be a pagan, he can know nothing of our mysteries: if a Jew, he is the enemy of Christian Baptism. It follows, that no tribunal on earth

---

remigant animæ populorum. Nemo vobis credat, nemo nobis: omnes contentiosi homines sumus. Quærendi sunt judices: si Christiani, de utraque parte dari non possunt; quia studiis veritas impeditur. De foris quærendus est judex: si paganus, non potest Christiana nosse secreta: si Judæus, inimicus est Christiani baptismatis: ergo in terris de hac re nullum poterit reperiri judicium; de cœlo quærendus est judex. Sed ut quid pulsamus ad cœlum, quum habeamus hic in Evangelio testamentum? Quia hoc loco recte possunt terrena cœlestibus comparari: tale est quod quivis hominum habens numerosos filios, quamdiu pater præsens est, ipse imperat singulis; non est adhuc necessarium testamentum: sic et Christus, quamdiu præsens in terris fuit (quamvis nec modo desit) pro tempore quicquid necessarium erat Apostolis imperavit. Sed quomodo terrenus pater, dum se in confinio senserit mortis, timens ne post mortem suam—rupta pace—litigent fratres, adhibitis testibus, voluntatem suam de pectore morituro transfert in tabulas diu duraturas: et si fuerit inter fratres nata contentio, non itur ad tumulum, sed quæritur testamentum; et qui in tumulo quiescit, tacitus de tabulis loquitur. Vivus, cujus est testamentum, in cœlo est: ergo voluntas ejus, velut in testamento, sic in Evangelio requiratur."—S. Optat. De Schismate Donatist. adv. Parmen. Lib. V. cap. iii. p. 81. ed. Dupin.

can be found for this question; we must have recourse to heaven. But why knock at heaven's gate, when we have what we seek for in the Gospel? The Gospel (we may here fitly compare earthly things to heavenly) is like the case of a man having a large family; while the father is yet alive, he gives his orders to each; a will is not yet necessary. So too Christ, during his abode on earth, laid his commands on his Apostles, as this or that was needful. But when a human father feels himself to be dying, *fearing lest after his death the brothers should quarrel and go to law,* he summons witnesses and *transfers his will from his dying breast to tablets which shall long endure.* And if afterwards a quarrel arise between the brothers, they have recourse not to his tomb, but to his testament; and thus he who rests in his tomb, though really silent, speaks from his writing. Now He, whose testament we speak of, is alive in heaven; therefore his will must be sought, as in a testament, so in the Gospel." And then he proceeds to prove the Church's view of Baptism, by the conduct and words of our Lord[1].

Cent. 3. 248. *St Cyprian* was this year consecrated to the see of Carthage: shortly after this he addresses to "his son Quirinus" three books of Testimonies,

[1] See a strikingly similar passage—even to the expressions—in S. August. in Psal. xxi. Enarr. § ii. 30. p. 101. Tom. iv. ed. Ben.

or as we now speak, Texts; in which he goes through the various points of the abolition of the Law, the person and office of Christ, and the Christian duties, with a selection of texts in behalf of each of them. The Preface to the first Book sets before us[2] the feeling under which he did this. "Needs was it, dearest son, that I should comply with your religious wish, most earnestly entreating of me the divine directions, which the Lord has vouchsafed through the holy Scriptures for our grounding and building up; that, rescued from the darkness of error, and illumined by his pure and radiant light, we may, by such saving intimations, hold the way of life."

From Cyprian let us ascend to one whom he "so highlie estemed, that whensoeuer he would haue his booke, he was wont to say, Geue vs now the Master[3]."

---

[2] "Obtemperandum fuit — fili carissime — desiderio tuo spiritali impensissima petitione divina magisteria poscenti, quibus nos Dominus per scripturas sanctas erudire et instruere dignatus est, ut a tenebris erroris abducti, et luce ejus pura et candida luminati, viam vitæ per salutaria sacramenta teneamus."—S. Cypriani Testimon. Libri adv. Judæos, Lib. I. Procem.

[3] Ridley, loc. cit. p. 99. The date assigned in the text, is the year following that in which Cave conjectures that he embraced the Montanist opinions; and Pamelius, Bp. Kaye, and Dr Neander, suppose the treatise adv. Hermogenen to have been written after that event.

About

200. *Tertullian* writes[1]: "I adore the fulness of Scripture, which makes plain to me both the Maker and the things made. But whether all things were made of any subject matter, I have as yet nowhere read. Let those of Hermogenes' school shew that it was written. If it be not written, let them fear the woe to which those are destined who add or take away."

In the preceding century wrote that other great opponent of the Gnostics,

Cent. 2. 176. *St Irenæus;* who asks[2]—"But what if the Apostles had not left us the Scriptures, ought we not to follow the order of tradition?"—a question which clearly implies, that, since the Scriptures have been given us, there is no need for tradition; and therefore, that the Scriptures contain sufficiently all doctrine. This, however, is expressly asserted in another place by this great man; who, having

---

[1] "Itaque sicut ea, quæ de aliquo prolata sunt, ostendit unde prolata sint: ita, quæ non ostendit unde prolata sint, ex nihilo prolata confirmat. Igitur, *in principio Deus fecit cœlum et terram.* Adoro Scripturæ plenitudinem, qua mihi et factorem manifestat et facta. In evangelio vero amplius et ministrum atque arbitrum rectoris invenio, *Sermonem.* An autem de aliqua subiacenti materia facta sint omnia, nusquam adhuc legi. Scriptum esse doceat Hermogenis officina. Si non est scriptum, timeat *væ* illud *adiicientibus aut detrahentibus* destinatum."—Adv. Hermog. c. xxii. p. 111. Tom. ii. ed. Semler.

[2] Cited by Abp. Tillotson, Part iv. Sect. 1.

been educated at Smyrna and afterwards made Bishop of Lyons, was most likely to know the sense and rule of the Eastern and Western Churches; and having been the pupil of Polycarp, as he was of St John,—so that St Basil says of him, ὁ ἐγγὺς τῶν Ἀποστόλων γενόμενος—may well be received as an authentic witness of the very teaching of the Apostles. He says[3]: "Read diligently the Gospels given unto us by the Apostles, and read diligently the Prophets; and you shall find every action and the *whole doctrine*, and the whole passion of our Lord preached in them. And indeed we have received the economy of our salvation by no other but by those, by whom the Gospel came to us; which truly they then preached, but afterwards, by the will of God, delivered to us in the Scriptures, to be the pillar and ground of our faith."

Here, then, we close our chain of quotations from the ancient ecclesiastical writers;—a chain reaching upwards[4], and encircling all branches of

---

[3] "Legite diligentius id quod ab Apostolis est evangelium nobis datum, et legite diligentius Prophetas, et invenietis universam actionem, et omnem doctrinam, et omnem passionem Domini nostri prædictum in ipsis."—Adv. Hæres. Lib. IV. c. xxxiv. ed. Ben.

[4] It may, perhaps, be observed, that we have adduced none of the Apostolic Fathers; but when it is considered, that we possess *genuine* writings of but three of them, and that these writings are so few as to occupy not more than 120 octavo pages; all marvel on that point will be removed. Let

the universal Church, from the era of the fourth œcumenical Synod.

To have begun them lower down would have been easy, though—as it was deemed—unnecessary; for if, during these four centuries, Romanists cannot produce a single undoubted Catholic as a voucher for their pretended tradition, that tradition must be indeed a pretence. But to pass from the practice of friends to that of enemies; if it be no proof, at least it is a strong confirmation of our point, that the innovators of doctrine have always pretended to confirm their novelties *out of Scripture*, and the enemies of Christianity have ever opposed themselves *to the Scriptures*[1]; neither party dreaming of any other repository of Christian

Argument from the practice of heretics and infidels.

---

me conclude by assuring the reader, that "these extracts, strong as they are in themselves, give but a faint impression of the distinct and familiar apprehension of this great principle in the minds of the Fathers, as evinced by their writings. It is not in one or two formal enunciations, but in the spirit, the drift, the concealed assumption of their arguments, that we discern this fundamental doctrine of the Anglican Church. It is by tracing the course of a controversy, and observing how habitually present it was to the reasonings of all the contending parties, how it guided the deliberations and decisions of councils, how it is incidentally brought out into words, that we realize to ourselves the strength of our position." Newman on Romanism, p. 382.

[1] *e. g.* Marcion; who—as Tertullian tells us (cont. Marc. Lib. I.)—wrote a whole volume of "Antitheses," or what he supposed to be contradictions between the Old and New Testaments.

truth. If, then, the doctrine of our 6th Article be not true, we are at a loss to discover what is true. For what note of a Christian verity does it want? Antecedently agreeable to right reason, and —though, from its nature, not in express words taught in Scripture, yet—clearly not contrary to Scripture, it has from the beginning been held as true, by all and in all churches.

Writers of the middle ages.

II. Nor was this the doctrine only of the primitive Church. It was very generally held, and by the most learned theologians, taught, in the middle ages. Thus, in the Eastern Church, we find Nechites, Archbishop of Nicomedia, in a conference with a Latin Bishop, in 1137, saying incidentally, while arguing on the supremacy claimed by the Pope over the whole Church: "We do not *in any creed* find, that we are bound to confess the Roman Church in particular, but one holy, catholic, and Apostolic Church. This is what I say of the Roman Church, which I revere with you; but I do not with you believe it a duty to follow her necessarily in all things, nor that we ought to relinquish our rites, and adopt her mode of performing the sacraments, *without examining it by reason* and the *Scriptures*[2]."

In the Western Church, we find in the 13th

---

[2] See Palmer's Compendious Eccles. Hist. p. 208.

century[1], the author of the *Destructorium vitiorum* declaring, that though the light of nature was sufficient to give some knowledge of God, as that He is the Cause of all things, yet that by it men could not learn how just and merciful and glorious He is; "neither did ever any man learn it, but either by Divine revelation, or by the information of holy Scripture; so that the holy Scripture is that light, *by which*, in this state of wayfaring men, we may have *sufficient knowledge* of *all things to salvation.* Singularly like this is the conclusion of *Duns Scotus* in the 14th century, in a place where he proposes the question—"whether the supernatural knowledge, necessary to a traveller through this life, be sufficiently declared in the sacred Scrip-

[1] I originally placed this in the 13th century, because I imagined its author to be the famous Alexander of Hales, "the irrefragable doctor," who flourished A. D. 1230. I have since had an opportunity of investigating this, and find that the work is generally ascribed to Alexander Anglus; but who he was, does not seem to be quite certain, for I find the following note attached to his name in the Catalogue of the Bodleian at Oxford: "Alexander Anglus—Possevinus videtur insinuare hunc esse eundem cum Alexandro de Ales. A quibusdam ei attribuitur cognomen Carpenter, seu Fabricius." So that, while some attribute it to Alexander of Hales, who was an Englishman, others ascribe it to an obscure writer, likewise an Englishman, surnamed Carpenter, who lived about 1429. Cave himself (H. L. t. i.) is divided; at one time giving it to the former, "constanti Codicum MSS. fide," at another to the latter, on the ground that his name is attached to a MS. of it in the library of St. Peter's College.

ture?" which he answers in the *affirmative.* In the next age, that eminent lawyer and divine in France, *Gerson,* says: "In the trial of doctrines, that which is first and principally to be considered is, whether a doctrine be conformable to the holy Scriptures.....The reason of this is, because the *Scripture* is delivered to us as a *sufficient* and *infallible rule* for the government of the whole ecclesiastical body and its members, to the end of the world. So that it is such an act, such a rule or exemplar, that any other doctrine which is not conformable to it is to be renounced as heretical, or to be accounted suspicious, or not at all appertaining to religion." About this time also writes Peter D'Ailly, Cardinal-bishop of Cambray;—having distinguished at length between principles, or verities of the sacred Canon, and conclusions theological; he winds up by pronouncing, "that only is a theological discourse, which consisteth of sayings and propositions contained in the sacred Scriptures, or of such as may be deduced from them; and that then only we say a thing is theologically proved, when it is concluded out of the words of holy Scripture." Passages to the same effect might be adduced from Rupert Tuitensis, Ockham, Gregory Ariminensis, Thomas Waldensis, De Lyra, and several others; for, as Archbishop Laud observes, "the fathers are plain, the schoolmen not strangers to it;"—but for these it must

suffice to refer to Dr Field[1] (of the Church, Appendix to the 3rd Book), and to conclude this notice in his words; "many more might be alleadged to the same purpose; but these may suffice to let us know what the doctrine of the Church was in the dayes of our fathers; for they deliuer not their priuate conceipts, but tel vs what all good and iudicious men conceiued of these things in their times."

The Church of Rome holds this doctrine.

Cent. 15.

III. But we hasten to shew, that the doctrine of our Churches on this point, is the doctrine of the Church of Rome itself. We begin with the 15th century.

Raymund de Sabunde, a Spanish doctor and president of the school at Tolosa, (we are told by Cave[2]) in 1436 published his 'Thesaurus divinarum Considerationum;' in which he declares that all revealed truths are contained in Scripture, and that by this medium alone God has made them known to Christians[3].

---

[1] From whose learned work the foregoing four quotations have been made.

[2] Hist. Litt. Tom. i. Appendix.

[3] A tolerably good proof of this is, that, after the Council of Trent, his book was prohibited in the Index of Clement VIII. In this century, too, flourished Dr Reginald Peacock, Bishop successively of St. Asaph and Chichester; a great adversary of the Lollards—though he seems not to have approved of the forcible means employed to restore them to obedience. He wrote two books, in each of which he main-

In the 16th century, not to dwell on the fact, that when,—in consequence of the charge of heresy which the Dominican friars had for the second time brought against Zuingle,—he had disputed publicly with Faber the vicar general of the Bishop of Constance; the *senate of Zurich* decreed, that he should continue to preach as before, and that the clergy should preach *nothing except* what they could *prove by testimonies of the Gospel* and the *authority of holy Scriptures*[4]:—passing by this, the SYNOD OF TRENT claims our especial attention. This synod is commonly looked upon as having finally sanctioned the popular Romish doctrine of Tradition; but by an attentive examination of it we shall be led to doubt the correctness of this opinion,—at least, to question the truth with which Romanists refer to this council in support of their doctrine.

Cent. 16.

Synod of Trent.

Before the synod defines any thing, they judge it necessary that the Creed, as it is used in all churches (which Creed is that of Constantinople) be in so many express words professed by their whole assembly, as "the principle in which all, who profess the Christian faith, do necessarily

---

tained our doctrine. The MS. of the former, Cave says, is preserved in the library of Trinity Coll.

[4] Gerdes. Introd. in Hist. Evan. Renov. in XVI. Seculo. Vol. i. p. 286.

agree; and the firm and only foundation, against which the gates of Hell shall never prevail[1]." Whence it is evident, that if this be the only foundation, nothing may be laid as a foundation beside. And in that "all Christians do *necessarily* agree" in this, they plainly intimate, that there is no absolute necessity that Christians should agree in other things. Now every article of this Creed may be, and repeatedly has been, proved from the canonical Scriptures; therefore we conclude that the canonical Scriptures do contain all doctrine necessary for salvation[2]. But let us examine their proceedings a little further. In the 4th Session, the synod in providing—that in matters pertaining to faith and morals "no one shall presume, by wresting the sacred Scriptures to his own private sense, to interpret them contrary to that sense which has been and is still held by holy mother Church; whose province it is to judge of their true sense and interpretation;"—the synod thus clearly intimate their conviction that the sacred Scriptures are the foundation of faith and morals (else, why mention them only in connec-

---

[1] Sess. 3. Decret. de Symb. Fid.

[2] See Bishop Bull's Vindication, &c. § 30. Vol. ii. Works, ed. Burton. Yet, notwithstanding this, such things have occurred, in some modern discussions, as Romanists denying, that the consubstantiality or divinity of the Son can be proved from the Scripture without tradition.

tion with faith and morals?): nor is there—so far as I have been able to ascertain—in this or in any other decree of the synod, nor even in the creed of Pope Pius, so much as a hint at any other office belonging to the Church with regard to the Faith, than that of determining the "true sense and interpretation of Scripture." Pope Pius, indeed, in his creed mentions the "apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions;" but these the person only professes "most firmly to admit and embrace;"—indeed the word "credo," "I believe as a matter of saving faith," is most studiously avoided throughout the Roman pontiff's additions[3]. Every variety of expression besides this is employed;—'I profess'—'I receive and admit'—'I embrace and receive'—'I constantly hold'—'I firmly assert'—'I undoubtingly receive and profess;'—even the final affirmation, which relates to "this true catholic faith, beyond which no one can be safe,"—is only "I profess and truly hold." In the clause relating to the "true, proper and

[3] It is right to remark, that at the very beginning of the whole form we have "Ego N. *firma fide credo* et profiteor omnia et singula quæ," &c. Yet even here the wording is most skilful; for it is "quæ continentur in symbolo fidei, quo S. Romana Ecclesia utitur, videlicet: 'Credo in unum Deum Patrem,' &c.;" which are the very words employed in the 3rd Session, as a preface to the Constantinop. Creed. So that this "credo" *may* only refer to the creed of the Catholic Church.

propitiatory sacrifice for quick and dead offered to God in the mass," (the belief in which has been thought by some sufficient, of itself, to constitute the papists heretics, and which undoubtedly is a blasphemous doctrine)—even there the expression is simply 'I profess.' So little (as it would appear) did the pontiff dare to 'require of necessity for eternal salvation' a belief in any thing which could not be proved out of holy Scripture. —Bearing this in mind, if we turn to the 4th Session, we shall find the like duplicity and caution. The synod there declare, that the Christian "truth and discipline are contained in written books *and* unwritten traditions." Now they were well aware that the controversy then was, whether the Christian doctrine was only *in part* contained in Scripture[1]. But they did not dare to frame their decree openly in accordance with the modern

[1] Thus the first of the four articles extracted from the works of Luther, for examination and condemnation by the theologians at Trent, was—"Que les articles de la doctrine Chretienne nécessaires à croire étoient tous compris dans l'Ecriture Sainte; que c'etoit une fiction humaine d'y joindre des Traditions non écrites comme laissées à l'Eglise par Jesus Christ et ses Apôtres, et derivées jusqu'à nous par une succession d'Evêques non interrompue: et que c'étoit un sacrilège d'egaler leur autorite à celle de l'Ancien et de Nouveau Testament." Hist. du Conc. de Trente, par P. Sarpi, et traduite par F. Le Courayer, T. i. p. 235. The learned author of the Treatise on the Church (Vol. ii.) takes the same view of the matter, as that advocated in the text.

Romish view: they did not venture to affirm, as they might easily have done, that the Christian verity 'was contained *partly* in written books, and *partly* in unwritten traditions.' That this was what they intended, and is the meaning which would strike the cursory reader, I do not dispute; —indeed, it is most obvious to any one reading the history of this Council[2]; but that it was an Italian mode of prevarication, which placed the decree as it now stands,—when we remember the instances of a similar sort already adduced,—I venture to think[3].

---

[2] Thus Sarpi assumes it as an undeniable matter, over and over again; accordingly, the Catechismus ad Parochos, set forth by order of the Synod of Trent, (see Sess. 25. and Sess. 24. c. 7.) says, in the preface, that "the sum of the doctrine delivered to the faithful is contained in the word of God, which is *distributed into* Scripture and Tradition." [Omnis autem doctrinæ ratio, quæ fidelibus tradenda sit, verbo Dei continetur, quod in Scripturam traditionesque distributum est.] Cat. ad Par. Procem. Quæst. xii.

[3] A similar duplicity and designed want of determinateness is observable in the wording of the 25th Session, "de Invocatione, Veneratione," &c. On this subject I cannot refrain from subjoining some remarks by Mr Tyler in a work already referred to, and published since the above was written. He says: "We have already alluded to the very great latitude of interpretation which the words of the Council admit. The expressions indeed are most remarkably elastic; capable of being expanded widely enough to justify those of the Church of Rome who allow themselves in the practice of asking for aid and assistance, temporal and spiritual, to be expected from the saints themselves; and, at the same time, the words of the decree admit of being so far contracted as not in

Taken in this view, their decree maintains our doctrine; which has thus, to say the least, just as

---

appearance palpably to contradict those who allege that the Church of Rome never addresses a saint with any other petition, than purely and simply that the saint would by prayer intercede for the worshippers. The words 'suppliantly to invoke them,' and 'to fly to their prayers, HELP, and SUCCOUR,' are sufficiently comprehensive to cover all kinds of prayer for all kinds of benefits; whilst 'the invocation of them to pray for us even individually' will countenance those who would restrict the faithful to an entreaty for their prayers only. Whatever may be the advantage of this latitude of interpretation, in one point of view it must be a subject of regret. Complaints had long been made in Christendom, that other prayers were offered to the saints, besides those which petitioned only for their intercession; and if the Council of Trent had intended it to be a rule of universal application, that in whatever words the invocation of the saints might be couched, they should be taken to mean only requests for their prayers, it may be lamented that no declaration to that effect was given. The manner in which writers of the Church of Rome have attempted to reconcile the prayers actually offered in her ritual, with the principle of invoking the saints only for their prayers, is indeed most unsatisfactory. Whilst to some minds the expedient to which those writers have had recourse carries with it the stamp of mental reservation, and spiritual subterfuge, and moral obliquity; others under the influence of the purest charity will regret in it the absence of that simplicity and direct openness in word and deed, which we regard as characteristic of the religion of the Gospel; and will deprecate its adoption as tending, in many cases inevitably, to become a most dangerous snare to the conscience."—Tyler's Prim. Christ. Worship, p. 236.

Just as this Essay was on the point of publication, I met with the following paragraph in a letter to Dr Jelf by the

much support from the Council of Trent as that of our opponents. To take one more instance: in

---

pious and learned Vicar of St Mary the Virgin's, at Oxford. Mr Newman says (p. 4. ed. 2.), speaking of the same decrees of the Council as Mr Tyler is engaged with,—"Those (Decrees of Trent) *expressed* her authoritative teaching, and they will continue to express it, while she so teaches. The simple question is, whether taken *by themselves, in their mere letter,* they express it; whether in fact other senses, *short of the sense conveyed in the present authoritative teaching of the Roman Church,* will not fulfil their letter, and may not even now in point of fact be held in that Church." This is exactly the view I have been endeavouring to maintain. My complaint is—not that the Church of Rome teaches a substantially different doctrine now, from what she set forth in the Tridentine Decrees (for she teaches the same now as then, and then as now): but that—determining for her own purposes to inculcate one doctrine, but, on account of its manifest falsity, not choosing to compromise *the Church,*—the theologians at Trent did, with characteristic craftiness, so word their Decrees with designed ambiguity, that while with the explanations of the Catechism they would "show one face" to the members of the Romish obedience; they might in point of fact, taken by themselves, in the mere letter, fall short of the sense intended. This doubtless is a serious charge; but really, with the greatest stretch of charity, I know not how to think otherwise; especially when I remember this little fact—that "the *language of the Council of Trent* has been their invariable refuge, whenever we have pressed them hard with the errors and superstitions prevalent in their Church*." In fine, the whole affair bears a very close and lamentable resemblance to the "*Catechism of Racow,*" drawn up ostensibly as a standard and just representation of Socinianism; but

* See p. 9. of the first of a series of letters to Dr Wiseman (which will long outlive the memory of the circumstances which called them forth) by the Rev. W. Palmer, of modern theologians, *facile princeps.*

Sess. 5. (4) the synod thus decree concerning Original Sin. "If any one denies that newly born infants ought to be baptized—even though sprung of parents who have been themselves baptized; or says, that for the remission of sins, indeed, they are baptized, and yet do not derive from Adam any original guilt which needs to be purged by the laver of regeneration, in order to the attainment of life eternal;...let him be anathema; since that which the Apostle hath said—'Through one man sin entered into the world and death by sin; and so death hath passed upon all men, for that all have sinned'—is to be no otherwise understood, than as the catholic Church always and in all places has understood it." Here the synod clearly adopt the catholic rule; they first *prove* their position—that infants do derive, &c.—from the words of *Scripture;* they rest their anathema upon *them*, "quoniam;" and then *confirm* this by the *interpretation* of the Church catholic, in the very words of Vincent of Lerins. Rome here holds the very doctrine which we have all along been endeavouring to prove is the truth; being the doctrine of our Article, and of Athanasius, Austin, and all the other orthodox Fathers.—

---

really (as is notorious) by omitting many Socinian tenets and institutions, which might have contributed to render the sect still more odious, intended to impose upon the Christian world. —See Mosheim's Eccles. Hist. Cent. XVI. ch. iv. § 19.

Accordingly, we find even Roman theologians, from that time to the present day, admitting the perfection of Scripture, and making the same distinction between it and tradition, as we do. Thus we may instance in the first place, *Antoine Marinier*, who, in the discussion which took place at Trent on the articles selected from Luther's works for condemnation, having traced the history of the manner in which God's successive revelations had been made to man, and having acknowledged "que l'Eglise avoit été tres parfaite avant même qu'aucun des Apôtres ecrivît, et que quand on n'auroit rien ecrit, elle n'auroit manqué d'auncune perfection;" and "qu'il étoit indubitable, que ce que *les Apôtres* avoient ecrit, et ce qu'ils avoient enseigné de vive voix, etoit de même autorité, puisqu'ils avoient parlé comme ecrit par l'inspiration du Saint Esprit;" he continues[1]—"que l'on ne pouvoit donc pas distinguer de deux sortes d'articles de foi, les uns publiez par ecrit, et les autres qu'il étoit defendu d'enseigner autrement que de bouche.....Que si quelqu'un soutenoit le contraire, il auroit deux

[1] It is true, that Pallavicini makes no mention of this speech of Marinier's; but there is every reason to suppose (as Le Courayer shows), that Fra-Paolo is relating nothing but the strictest matter of fact: and one thing is certain,—as Pallavicini himself allows—that there was a wide difference of opinion, among the bishops at Trent, on this article of tradition and Scripture.

grands difficultez à resoudre; l'une de dire en quoi consiste la difference de ces deux sortes d'articles; l'autre, comment les successeurs des Apôtres ont osé ecrire ce que Dieu avoit defendu de mettre par ecrit.....Qu'ainsi entrer dans cette discussion ce seroit passer entre Charibde et Scylla; et qu'il valoit mieux imiter les Pères, qui s'etoient toujours servis de l'Ecriture seule au besoin, *sans jamais oser metre la Tradition en competence avec elle.*" Upon which Le Courayer observes; "Quoiqu'il ne soit pas exactement vrai, que les Pères se soient *toujours servis de l'Ecriture seule au besoin,* comme on le voit par les Ecrits et les disputes des Pères, surtout depuis le cinquième siecle; il est constamment certain, qu'ils n'ont jamais égalé la Tradition à l'Ecriture, et quils ont toujours mis beáucoup de difference entre l'autorité de l'une et de l'autre."—*Hist. Conc. Trid.* Vol. i. p. 238.

Other Romish theologians quoted. Cent. 16.

Cassander (as quoted by Field) says, "by traditions concerning doctrines of the faith we understand, *not any divine unwritten verity,* or *any point of doctrine not contained in Scripture;* but such points of doctrine, as though they be not found in precise terms in Scripture, yet are deduced from it when rightly understood and interpreted. So that this tradition is nothing else but the explanation and interpretation of Scripture: and therefore it may not unfitly be said, that Scripture is a sort of tradition folded and

sealed up, and that tradition is Scripture unfolded, explained, and opened." About the same time wrote our countryman, *Stapelton*, who for his popish predilections was made a Cardinal. In a work of his, cited by Archbishop Laud, he says: "We confess that Scripture is the foundation and pillar of the faith in its own way; i. e. in the nature of testimony and in the matter to be believed." Cardinal *Bellarmine* himself writes, "The rule of the catholic faith ought to be certain and known. If it be not certain, it cannot be a rule; if it be not known, it can be no rule for us."—"But," says he in a subsequent place, "there is nothing either more sure or more known, than holy Scripture." Therefore—by his own showing—the holy Scripture is the rule of the catholic faith, both in itself, and to us likewise: for (as Archbishop Laud observes) "in things simply necessary to salvation, it is abundantly known and manifest."

In the 17th century M. l'Abbé Fleury, in his inimitable Discourses on Ecclesiastical History, speaks so often and so explicitly to our purpose, that the difficulty is to select one or two short passages. The following will serve for examples.— In the 2nd Discourse, speaking of the method of teaching adopted by the Church in the first six centuries, he says—"Quelle science donc demandoit —ou à un Prêtre ou à un Evêque? D'avoir lu et relu l'Ecriture sainte, jusqu'à la sçavoir par cœur, Cent. 17.

s'il étoit possible,—de l'avoir bien méditée, *pour y trouver les preuves de* TOUS *les articles de foi*, et de toutes les grandes régles des mœurs et de la discipline;" &c. Again—"car quiconque portoit le nom de Chrétien, faisoit profession de *ne se fonder que* sur l'Ecriture: les hérétiques en tiroient leurs objections, et les Catholiques leurs réponses." (pp. 68, 70.) Once more, in his 5th Discourse, treating of the allegorical sense of Scripture, as indulged in by the Fathers;—"Il n'en est pas de même des sens figurés que nous lisons dans Origine, dans S. Ambroise, dans S. Augustin; nous pouvons les regarder comme les pensées particulières de ces Docteurs, à moins que nous les trouvions autorisés par une tradition plus ancienne; et nous ne devons suivre ces explications, qu'en tant qu'ils contiennent des vérités conformes à celle que nous trouvons ailleurs dans l'Ecriture, prise en son sens littéral. Car *c'est à ce sens* qu'il en faut toujours revenir pour *fonder un dogme*, c'est *le seul* qui puisse *servir de preuve* dans la dispute." (p. 215)—And, to bring this to a conclusion, M. l'Abbé de la Mennais, the apostle in France of ultra-montane opinions, nevertheless says, in a work which he published some years since, that 'the laws and truths of revelation are comprised in Scripture, though tradition and the Church explain their meaning.' His words are these: "Troisiemement, nous avons montré que le Christianisme est l'en-

semble de toutes les vérités et de toutes les lois que Dieu a révélées à l'homme, et qu'il étoit impossible à l'homme de les connoître autrement que par une révélation divine. Ces lois et ces vérités sont renfermées dans l'Ecriture. Ainsi l'atteste la societé Chrétienne, à qui l'on accordera sans doute de savoir quels sont les dogmes et les préceptes du Christianisme." And then, as if to prevent the possibility of a mistake, he subjoins in a note: "On doit toujours entendre que, pour découvrir avec certitude ces lois et ces vérités dans l'Ecriture, qui ne s'interprète par elle-même; il est nécessaire qu'elle soit expliquée, d'apres la tradition, par une autorité vivante et infaillible[1]."

Argument from the contradictions of Romanists,

IV. But we rest not on the express assertions of Romish writers; we argue further from their mutual *contradictions:* we say, that all the theologians of the Roman obedience involuntarily testify their persuasion that the Scriptures do contain all necessary doctrine, by attempting to prove for themselves, from Scripture, every point which they assure *us* tradition only has conveyed to them.

stated in the abstract.

The argument, in an abstract view of it, will stand thus.

---

[1] Essai sur l'Indifférence, T. iv. p. 210. This, barring the "infaillible," is catholic and good. Indeed, this would appear to be the only office which the Abbé ascribes to tradition: see particularly pp. 156, 160. Mr Palmer (Treatise, Vol. ii. p. 16.) cites Bailly, another living Roman-catholic writer.

If Scripture be not sufficient, it must be because all necessary doctrine is not contained in it, (which is their position): that is, there are certain essential doctrines which have been conveyed to us by *Tradition only*. Now, what is conveyed to *one* by *Tradition only*, that must be conveyed to *all* in the like manner. But *some* persons have learnt certain alleged traditionary doctrines from Scripture: which is absurd. Therefore *all* essential doctrines have been conveyed to us by Scripture: therefore Scripture is sufficient. We proceed now to support this position by a reference to facts.

Examples adduced.

1. Let us begin with the doctrine of *Infant-baptism*. In speaking of this Cardinal Bellarmine says: "The Catholic Church has always taught, that infants are to be baptized.....This verity is proved by three kinds of arguments. *The first is taken from the Scriptures:* now we have in Scripture three proofs; the first of these is derived from the type in the Old Testament,—for circumcision was the type of baptism.....*this proof certainly cannot be eluded.* The second proof is collected from the coupling together two places in the Gospel, viz. John iii. 'Except a man,' &c. and Matt. xix. Mark x. Luke xviii. 'Suffer little children,' &c. The third proof is drawn from those places where whole families are said to have been baptized," &c.[1]

[1] "Catholica Ecclesia semper docuit infantes baptizandos .....Probatur hæc veritas tribus argumentorum generibus.

Delahogue writes in a different strain: "Protestants themselves acknowledge the necessity and truth of traditions for many doctrines and precepts *which are not found in Scriptures.* For example, with Catholics they hold that the Holy Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son; that the Blessed Mary remained a virgin after she had brought forth her First-born; that *little children are to be baptized;*" &c.[2] Here, then, we have two great Romish authorities; the one asserting that Infant-baptism is only to be proved by tradition, the other proving it by Scripture[3].

Primum sumitur a Scripturis; habemus autem in Scripturis tria argumenta. Primum sumitur a figura Testamenti Veteris: nam Circumcisio figura erat Baptismi.....certe eludi argumentum non potest. Secundum argumentum colligitur ex duobus locis Evangelii simul junctis: Joan. iii. *Nisi quis renatus fuerit,* &c. et Matt. xix.—Marc. x.—Luc. xviii.—*Sinite parvulos venire ad me,* &c. Tertium argumentum colligitur ex locis illis ubi dicuntur baptizatæ integræ familiæ," &c.—Card. Bellarm. De Sacr. Baptismi, L. I. c. viii.

[2] "Ipsi Protestantes agnoscunt Traditionum necessitatem et veritatem pro multis dogmatibus et præceptis quæ non reperiuntur in Scripturis. Nimirum cum Catholicis tenent Spiritum S. a Patre et Filio procedere; B. Mariam post partum in virginitate permansisse; baptizandos esse parvulos;" &c.—Delahogue, Tractatus de Eccles. Christi, Appendix i. De Traditione.

[3] See also Laud's Conf., § 15. Num. 4. who cites five other Romanists—Maldonatus, Ferus, Salmeron, Jansenius, and Pope Innocent III. himself, besides two schoolmen and St Ambrose, in support of the Scripture proof; and Mr Palmer cites Tournely.

2. We have seen that Delahogue can find the *Procession* and the *Perpetual virginity* in tradition only; also Melchior Canus finds the latter doctrine in tradition only; his words are[1]; "the perpetual virginity of Mary—the conversion of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ—you will not find so expressly stated in the canonical books, but," &c. On the other hand, the Fathers, and many theologians of the Romish Church, prove them from Scripture; as *e.g.* Athanasius, Epiphanius, Gregory Nyssene, as to the former doctrine; Jerome, Epiphanius, Ambrose, and Austin, as to the latter[2].

3. Melchior Canus in the passage just quoted says, that *Transubstantiation* is not expressed in Scripture[3]; so too said Cardinal Cajetan. "Cardinal Cajetan affirms that there is in Scripture nothing of force or necessity to infer Transubstantiation out of the words of institution; and that the words ('seclusa ecclesiæ authoritate'—'setting aside the

---

[1] "Perpetuam Mariæ virginitatem—conversionem panis et vini in corpus et sanguinem Christi—non ita expressa in libris canonicis invenies, sed adeo tamen certa in fide sunt, ut contrariorum dogmatum auctores ecclesia hæreticos judicavit."—Melchior Canus, Lib. I. de Euchar. c. 34, cited by Bishop Taylor, Dissuas. Pt. II. B. II. S. iii. Vol. xi. p. 96.

[2] See Bp. Taylor, Dissuas. Pt. II. B. I. S. ii. p. 408.

[3] He says the same also in his Loc. Com. lib. iii. c. 3. fund. 2, cited by Taylor. Vol. ix. p. 434.

decree of the Church') are not sufficient[4]." It need hardly be observed, that the Council of Trent ground their belief in it upon Scripture. (Sess. 13. c. 4.)

4. The doctrine of the *Descent of Christ into Hell* is not warranted by any place of Scripture, but only by Tradition, according to Scotus and Stapleton: Bellarmine, however, is resolute that "the Scriptures teach this everywhere[5]."

6. The lawfulness of *praying to Saints*, and *worshipping their images and relics*, rests only on Tradition, according to Melchior Canus[6]: "That the help of the holy martyrs is to be implored in prayer, and their memories to be preserved, and their images venerated.....the Sacred Writings have, haply, no where delivered."—But Milner finds this in Scripture; "That it is lawful and profitable to invoke the prayers of the angels, is plain from Jacob's asking and obtaining the angel's blessing.....The same also is sufficiently plain,

---

[4] Bp. Taylor, of the Real Presence, Sec. II. Works, Vol. ix. p, 433; where he shews that the same opinion was held, or admitted as probable, by Cardinals Fisher and D'Ailly, and by Scotus, Bellarmine, Biel, Odo Cameracencis. See also Dissuas. Part II. B. II. Sect. iii. p. 102.

[5] See Abp. Laud, Confer. § 12. Num. 2.

[6] "Sanctorum martyrum auxilium precibus implorandum, eorumque memorias celebrandas, imagines venerandas esse ..... sacræ literæ nusquam forte tradiderunt." — Melchior Canus, Loci Theolog. Lib. III. c. iii.

with respect to the Saints, from the Book of Revelation." And again, "Dr P. is very positive that there is no Scriptural warrant for retaining and venerating these exterior memorials (images &c.).....Does he remember the Ark of the Covenant made by the command of God[1]?" &c.

These inconsistencies of Romanists themselves we surely may claim as a proof of the error of their system. If (as Bellarmine defines[2]) the rule of the Catholic faith—to be the rule—must be certain and known; how little of a rule can that be, concerning which scarcely two of its advocates are agreed. How infinitely safer and surer must be the faith of a Catholic English Churchman, which is founded on a rule (even by the confession of our adversaries) known and read of all men, both sure and steadfast—the inspired Scriptures of the living God!

---

[1] End of Controversy, p. 251, 256.

[2] See supra, p. 111.

CHAPTER IV.

We have at last arrived at the end of the proof proposed, in support of the doctrine maintained by the British Churches relative to the sufficiency of Holy Writ; and have at the same time nearly reached the limits which custom has assigned to an Essay of this kind. But before we actually draw to a conclusion, it seems expedient to refer shortly to the *objections* urged against our doctrine. To enumerate and answer all, indeed, would at any time prove an ungrateful task;—within the compass of these pages it would be impossible: for when men are prejudiced against a truth, a trifling object will frequently be so much magnified as to render them completely blind; or if hard pressed by an opponent, an unimportant difficulty will furnish a last resource, —particularly, should the object be rather to support a cause, than to advance the truth. I confine myself, therefore, to a few of the most popular, and apparently most cogent, of those objections which have from time to time been advanced; and must content myself with referring

The *objections* of Romanists proposed to be answered.

the reader, for a fuller consideration of the Romish objections, to such of our writers as have treated the subject at large,—especially to the convincing Author of the Treatise on the Church[1].

and divided into three classes.

The objections we proceed to notice, may be classed under three general heads:—I. Objections drawn from the accidents of the Holy Scriptures themselves;—II. Objections derived from certain practices of the British Churches;—III. Extracts from the ancient Ecclesiastical Doctors, by which it is attempted to prove the catholicity of what we assert to be the peculiar and erroneous dogma of the Church of Rome.

Class I.

I. By the 'accidents' of Holy Scripture we mean its origin, style, &c. And the objections made with regard to these are, that Christ gave no command to his disciples to *write*, only to *preach*, the Gospel; and that Scripture was written *casually*, on the impulse of the moment and from the fortuitous pressure of outward circumstances. That as its origin was casual, so its contents are *immethodical*, and its doctrines and precepts scattered up and down; displaying no systematic arrangement, and having no harmony or consistency in its parts. Hence it is argued, that there could have been no intention, on the part either of the sacred Writers themselves, or of Di-

[1] Vol. ii. pp. 22—33.

vine Providence, that these books of Scripture should comprise the standard of faith for the Church in all ages; and that the attempt to limit it to these is exclusive and arbitrary[2].

Against such arguments as some of these we must, in the first instance loudly protest, as a mode of arguing in itself most irreverent, and in its consequences most deplorable; for it clearly tends to heresy and infidelity[3], since it goes to deny the *inspiration*[4] of those books. Let us ask them in reply, how they know that the Gospels and Epistles had a fortuitous origin? The Church, either past or present, most certainly does not teach them so: on the contrary, she teaches them expressly, to "receive and venerate all the books as well of the Old as of the New Testament, *since one God is the Author of both*[5]." However apparently,

---

[2] Trevern, Discuss. Amical. T. i. p. 180. Milner, End of Controv. pp. 56, 82, &c.

[3] We actually find, that some of these objections have been employed, before now, by decided enemies to Christianity. See Butler's Analogy, Part II. ch. iii.

[4] It was the sentiment of Marinier at Trent (*loc. cit.* supra p. 109), "Qu'il n'etoit pas moins hardi et moins difficile de soutenir, que c'etoit *par hazard* qu'une partie de la doctrine Chretiene n'avoit point été ecrite, puisque cela seroit tres injurieux à la Providence, qui a dirigé les Apôtres dans la composition du Nouveau Testament."

[5] "Sacrosancta œcumenica et generalis Tridentina synodus,.....orthodoxorum Patrum exempla secuta, omnes libros tam

then, these books owed their existence to the events of the moment or the will of man, no Christian (who believes in their inspiration) can do otherwise than believe, that they had their origin in the profound counsels of the Eternal God. Indeed, any Romanist who argues thus, seems clearly to subject himself to the charge of heresy; inasmuch as it is *de fide* with his Church, that the Scriptures were written by the will of God. This consideration quite precludes the necessity of answering the argument drawn from the *immethodical structure* of the sacred Books[1]: though, indeed, it appears to me, that if this be an argument for any thing, it is rather an argument in favour of the genuineness of the Books, and the truth and earnestness which characterized their respective authors. —In fine, we may reply to these obejctions and to all of a similar sort, in the same way as the Bishop of Meaux did to the objections of certain infidels:..."il en reviendra toujours les mêmes lois, les mêmes miracles, les mêmes prédictions, le même suite d'histoire, le même corps de doctrine, et enfin la même substance. Que nous falloit-il davantage que ce fond inaltérable des livres sacrées, et que

---

tam veteris quam novi testamenti, quum utriusque unus Deus sit auctor,.....pari pietatis affectu ac reverentia suscipit et veneratur."—Conc. Trid. Sess. IV. init.

[1] For a fuller answer to this, see Mr Conybeare's Bampton Lects. Sect. I.

pouvions nous demander de plus à la Divine Providence[2]?" But this whole objection of Romanists is most presumptuous and absurd; for as we could by no means anticipate in what way God would make his revelation; so, when he has made it, we must believe that He has done so in the best manner which Infinite Wisdom dictated: hence, as long as we believe the Scriptures to be Divine, we cannot argue from any supposed defect in them.

II. The second class of objections is derived from the practice of the British, in common with all other, Churches: as, for instance, we continually refer to certain books as inspired and canonical, which inspiration and canonicity are proved by the testimony of the Church; therefore, it is alleged, the assertion of our 6th Article is at once overthrown.—Again, it is said, that we admit several doctrines and practices which cannot be proved but by tradition; as the Divinity of Christ, the Procession of the Holy Ghost, the perpetual Virginity, &c.—that we acknowledge the principle of tradition, by using the Creeds:—and finally, that we impose articles of faith not to be found in Scripture; as in some of the Thirty-nine Articles:—and therefore that we cannot complain of Romanists for exercising the same authority. Class II.

As to the first objection, it may be answered,

---

[2] Bossuet, Hist. Univ. T. ii. p. 193.

that—without dwelling on the proofs of Inspiration which may be derived from internal evidence—the 6th article means only, that Scripture contains all such necessary things as were *actually revealed.* There is no need to suppose, that the inspiration of the whole canon was actually the subject of revelation (though it was certainly the case with respect to some of the Sacred Books), because the inspiration of the whole would be known when the inspiration of each particular book was established; and this would be sufficiently demonstrated, as soon as its genuineness was ascertained; "since if a writer is in *some* instances inspired, it seems a necessary inference, that he would be guarded against any important errors in the *whole* of what he was to publish to the world as of Divine Authority[1]". In short, (to use the words of another prelate[2]) "that the Bible was written by inspired men, God setting his seal to their doctrine,

---

[1] Bp. Van Mildert in the 23rd of his truly valuable Boyle Lectures. Indeed, we cannot suppose that God would uphold man in committing a falsehood to *writing*, any more than to *preaching*. And the very fact, that the Bible has been accounted the inspired word of God, and as such the foundation of our faith in all ages, appears to prove its inspiration; in that it could not have been consistent with the promise of Christ to be with his Church, to have allowed the Church so universally and in all times to remain in error on such a vital point.

[2] Jer. Taylor, Dissuas. Part II. Introd. p. 271. Vol. x.

confirming by miracles what they first preached, and then wrote in a book, this is a matter of fact, and is no otherwise to be proved (unless God should proceed extraordinarily and by miracle) but by the testimony of wise men who saw it with their eyes, and heard it with their ears, and felt it with their hands."—But as to the next count: the Church of England does indeed receive the Creed, and all three Creeds, yet she does not acknowledge the principle of divine unwritten traditions; for she believes that the longer Creeds are but fuller explanations of the shorter one, made at a time when the *whole* Catholic Church could meet to bear witness as to the fact of what the faith was, which had been taught from the beginning in every branch of it; and that every clause of each of the three Creeds is contained in Scripture, and may be proved thereby[3]. And so far is she from thinking herself at liberty to add any new articles to the Rule of faith, or at least new explanations of old articles, that she not only believes all the Christian verities contained in the Creeds,

---

[3] The Council of Trent declares, that the Apostles' Creed (as it is usually styled) is "principium illud, in quo omnes, qui fidem Christi profitentur, necessario conveniunt, ac fundamentum firmum et *unicum*." (Sess. 3.) And Albertus Magnus (cited by Laud, § 11. Num. 2.), one of the most eminent of the schoolmen, writes, "Regula Fidei est concors Scripturarum sensus cum articulis fidei."

but most scrupulously retains the very "forms of sound words" themselves: consenting to the maxim of Tertullian, that "quod primum verum," and well knowing that the ancient Fathers at Nicæa and Constantinople "neither did add any new Article to the Rule of faith, nor a new sense to any old article[1]." Moreover, though our Church does require the assent of her ministers to the Thirty-nine Articles, she does not herein contradict her fundamental tenet, that Holy Scripture contains all things essential to salvation: for she requires them not—at least, the majority of them[2]—as necessary to *salvation*, only to *communion*; not—like Rome—*de fide*, but simply as pious and probable opinions, doctrines of theology, or historical facts; and therefore she herein only exercises the right which every body corporate possesses with regard to those who would become members of it, or act as its paid servants: and the 6th Article merely affirms, that nothing which is not contained in, nor may

---

[1] Bp. Bull's Vindication, sect. 28, wherein he shews that the sum of the explicatory addition made at the Council of Constantinople, was so far from being any thing new, that it had been acknowledged in *express terms* by the Church in Tertullian's day—some 200 years before; which express terms (it is worth remarking) are the identical terms used in the symbol usually—though erroneously—ascribed to St Athanasius.

[2] Of course, some are *de fide*; as *e. g.* the first five, the ninth, and some few others.

be proved by, Scripture, is to be required that it should be believed *as* an *article of the faith*[3].

III. We come now, in the last place, to the objections drawn from the alleged testimony of several of the Fathers, that Scripture does not contain the whole of Revelation, and that therefore recourse must be had, for some articles of the faith, to Tradition. Class III.

It does not seem necessary, in an Essay like this, to enter upon a consideration of the particular passages brought forward; we must be content to refer, for the consideration of several of the most striking, to the works of Archbishop Laud and Mr Palmer. It will suffice to remark, that Tertullian seems to be the writer on whom our opponents lay most stress (so far as the Author has had an opportunity of observing). In his noble tract 'de Prescriptione Hæreticorum' many passages, indeed, occur, which—taken by themselves—would undoubtedly seem to sanction the notion, that he upheld the popish doctine of an unwritten tradition containing doctrines of the faith not found in Scripture: but I am much mistaken, if—upon perusal of the context and consideration of the end he had in view—it will not appear that, so far from upholding that doctrine,

[3] See Bp. Bull's Vindic. sect. 27; and compare the Articles 20 and 34 of those agreed on at the Synod of London, A.D. 1562.

he most pointedly condemns it by constantly asserting the agreement between Scripture and this Apostolical tradition[1], which—for good reasons—he was compelled to resort to in his arguments with the heretics against whom he wrote.

But let me suggest that, even if all the passages, cited by Romanists in support of their doctrine, could not be shewn to be irrelevant, still we have a sufficient answer in this;—that a few expressions employed by some writer in the heat of controversy, can no more prove the deliberate judgment of that particular Father and the general tenor of his writings, than the erroneous opinions of some two or three Fathers (who were but fallible men) can prevail against the consenting voice of the great preponderance of witnesses to the "one Faith," in all the primitive ages and in each of the independent Churches. For instance, Tertullian in defending the catholic doctrine of the Trinity from the objections which some private Christians brought against it, gives utterance to a passage[2], which, taken by itself, might seem to

[1] Romanists seem to be fond of quoting any passages from the Fathers, in which the word "Tradition" occurs, as if it always meant what *they* understand by tradition: a proceeding this, about as sensible and ingenuous as that of the Covenanters in the 17th century, who used to quote passages from Scripture, wherever the word "covenant" occurred, to serve their purpose.—See Bp. Taylor's Dissuas. Works, Vol. x. p. 310.

[2] Adv. Praxeam, c. iii.

favour the Arian doctrine. And again, Cyril of Jerusalem[3], defending the practice of his Church with regard to the Eucharistic rites, endeavours "to persuade by an illustration" (as he terms it); which illustration might appear to countenance the doctrine of Purgatory. Yet these isolated passages uttered in the hurry of the moment, without sufficient consideration of their tendency, do not prove that the one writer believed the Son of God not to have existed from all eternity; nor that the other held a doctrine, of which Cardinal Fisher himself confesses, "whoever will read the commentaries of the old Greeks, will find no mention," and that the Latins did not receive it till "after the lapse of so many years:"—still less will they prove such to have been the doctrine at that day of the Western and Oriental Churches.

---

[3] Catechesis, xxiii. (de Myst. v.) § 10.

CONCLUSION.

RECAPITULATION.

IT now only remains, in conclusion, that we briefly recapitulate the general scope of our observations, and the line of argument which has been adopted.

The subject proposed was—that the Holy Scriptures do contain sufficiently all doctrine required of necessity for eternal Salvation through faith in Jesus Christ; a doctrine which formed the basis of the Reformation, and has been embodied by the Church of England in her Articles, and in which the preservation of the true faith of Christians seems to be involved: since, if it be rejected, there are no conceivable limits to the corrupt additions to our faith, which may follow upon that rejection; whereas if it be maintained, Christians ever have at hand an infallible standard of appeal, by which to determine whether, or no, any given doctrine formed part of the truth originally revealed by the Spirit of Christ to his Apostles, and by them transmitted to his Church for her continual guidance in the narrow path that leadeth unto life eternal.

Importance of our doctrine.

In the commencement of our task it seemed expedient, in order to make the course clear before us, to enter into an examination of some of the arguments which have been not unfrequently dwelt upon by those who have hitherto written on this subject. If in so doing the Author ventured to differ from any whose opinions are generally and justly honoured, he did so not altogether singly; and was actuated, not by a desire of depreciation, but by a love of truth; and he hopes that the remarks which, with unfeigned humility, he offered, may be thought—if not convincing—at least not absurd.

The scope of the argument which, after these preliminary observations, was entered upon, was twofold: his aim was, in the first place, to address himself to the reason, and in the next place, to the candour, of the reader;—he considered the subject first in the light of an antecedent probability, grounded upon reasons derived from the known attributes of the Deity and from the acknowledged design of the Holy Scriptures; and then he endeavoured, by summoning credible witnesses, succinctly to establish the fact, that our doctrine is identical with that which was maintained from the beginning, by the great majority in all known branches of the Universal Church, down to the close of the fifth century. Passing over the intermediate times, it next appeared that the learned writers, who flourished between the 11th and 16th centuries,

were no dissentients from the important truth: and finally, the decrees of the Synod of Trent itself, and some of the most eminent of the Romish theologians down to the present day, were adduced as witnessing against themselves, no less by their positive assertions in favour of the truth of our position, than by their mutual contradictions when attempting to establish their own peculiar system. Lastly, some of the most popular objections to our doctrine were answered.

The opposite doctrine is a mere modern theological opinion, never proposed *de fide;*

Here, then, he makes his stand; and he believes that he may venture to add, without fear of contradiction, that neither the Roman, nor any other branch of the Catholic Church, has ever proposed to its members as an article of the faith, nor even declared to be true, the doctrine that only a portion of revealed truth is contained in the Scriptures; and that (to borrow the words, once more, of an often quoted writer) this doctrine "is nothing but a mere theological opinion"—a most grievous one, undoubtedly—"which happens to be supported by the majority of their modern theologians." Indeed, so little can this opinion lay claim to any support from antiquity, that I believe it to be no older than the 16th century. It appears that the first writers against the Reformation did not refuse to argue from Scripture; but Pighius, a theologian of Louvain, finding this detrimental to his cause, was the first to put forward the doctrine of the

but invented in the 16th century.

insufficiency of Scripture and the necessity of unwritten tradition[1].

When, therefore, we contemplate these things: when, too, we remember that our blessed Lord himself was wont frequently to refer to Scripture, but *never to tradition*, in proof of what he said,—nay, that in that mysterious temptation in the wilderness "IT IS WRITTEN" was the chosen weapon of reproof;—when we call to mind, that in arguing alike with Jews and Gentiles, it was *Scripture* to which St Paul appealed;—that, knowing by a special revelation that he was "shortly to put off his earthly tabernacle," St Peter *wrote* his Epistle in order that, after his decease, the Church might "have his precepts always in remembrance;"—that, in short,

The practice of our Lord and his Apostles throws additional weight into our scale.

[1] "Longe alia nunc est ratio disputationum inter Pontificios, quàm tempore Eccii, Emseri et similium fuit. Illi enim Scripturæ armis nobiscum congredi non detrectabant. Pighius vero deprehendit, hoc institutum plus detrimenti quàm commodi dedisse regno Pontificio. Aliam igitur ipse viam magis compendiariam monstravit, cui si insistant, nullo negotio quidvis possent obtinere: ut scilicet, compositis omnibus, Rhetoricis artificiis declamitent de angustiis, de imperfectione, insufficientia, ambiguitate et obscuritate Scripturæ: et strenue pugnent pro necessitate, authoritate, perfectione, certitudine et claritate traditionum, non Scripturarum. Vidit enim in illis, quæ ex Scriptura defendi non possunt (quæ potissima regni Pontificii pars est) hac sola ratione victoriam, nec dubiam nec laboriosam fore. Et hoc consilium scriptores Pontificii, qui Pighium insecuti sunt, pro viribus omnes amplexi sunt," &c.—Martin. Chemnitz, Examen Concil. Trident. p. 15.

whether they would reprove or exhort, persuade, encourage, or console, the Holy Scripture, with its promises and threats, was the "throughly furnished" armoury from which, in every case, the Apostles' resources were derived:—and when, in addition to these, we recollect that in no part of the Word of God is a single hint to be discovered of any thing, besides what is therein recorded and to be therefrom deduced, being required of necessity for eternal salvation:—it does not seem too much to say, that the doctrine of the British Churches, on the sufficiency of Holy Writ, is agreeable to the teaching of the Third Person in the adorable Trinity;—is, in short, the very truth.

Hence, believing this with the full assurance of faith, and warned by the awful errors into which, through the denial of this vital principle, a sister Church has gradually fallen; we firmly hold it as Christians, and as Protestants we vindicate it: blessing the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who has preserved to us his Word, and has given us faith and humility to receive it, not as the word of men, but, as it is in truth, the Word of God. Nor can we wonder at those pious ancestors, who, "when persecution arose because of the word[1]"—rather than renounce the faith which

---

[1] The author alludes to the troubles which ensued on the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes; when many noble families,

taught them to prize the Bible as their best and perfect treasure, chose to quit their homes; and unfriended and alone—yet "not alone[2]!"—possessed of nothing but their Bible and their staff, journeyed to a land where Christians were allowed the free use[3] of God's most precious gift—the unadulterated

---

in more senses than one, quitted their country and estates, and migrated to the British Isles; from the union of two of whom he is himself sprung.

[2] John xvi. 32.

[3] Among other imputations injurious to their interests, which the superiors of the Romish faction in these kingdoms are now desirous to clear their communion from, that of keeping the poorer members in ignorance, and withholding from them the free use of the Scriptures, is one. And we must admit, that the Word is more generally circulated among them than formerly it was. But why is this? is it from a sincere wish to help forward their eternal welfare, and from a conviction of the blessings attendant on a study of the Bible?—I wish not to judge uncharitably: but—was it not the *pressure from without* that *forced* Romanists to make the first translation of the Bible into their mother-tongue? And is it not the *pressure from without* that has of late *forced* them to allow the freer circulation of it in these kingdoms, particularly in England? I say *in these kingdoms,* for alas! this is not so abroad. In Italy no such powerful external circumstances occur to interrupt the Pope's dominion; and therefore in Italy no such freedom is allowed. The author can vouch for the accuracy of the following lamentable fact. A friend of his—a gentleman who has resided many years in Italy, and who is acquainted with the Pope, intimate with many of the highest dignitaries of the Church and State, and well known to the chief of our countrymen who have resorted to Rome, Naples, and Sienna,—during the time that the cholera was

Record of his will: the love and light of which may our heavenly Father long preserve among us, and with it illumine our hearts, by his Holy Spirit, through Jesus Christ our Lord! Amen.

---

raging with such fearful violence in 1836—7, waited on the Cardinal Archbishop of Naples, to request his assistance in ameliorating the condition of the poor Italians there. In the course of conversation the archbishop gave utterance to the following sentiments: "Yes, said he, these poor people are a very good dispositioned, simple sort of people: I would do what I could for them: but—GOD FORBID THAT THEY SHOULD KNOW HOW TO READ!!"

Does not this little anecdote speak a volume? does it not make us very suspicious of the motives of those who, on the one hand, would withhold the Scriptures from the people, and on the other, teach the sufficiency of oral tradition? Why refuse the Scriptures to them,—why be afraid to "come to their light," but that by this light "their deeds would be reproved?" Surely ignorance of the written Word, and the assertion of an independent oral tradition, must be found to be the best preservatives of superstition and error.

THE END.

ADDENDA.

THE words given in p. 61, n. (4), as if from the Council of Constance, were extracted from Cave's Hist. Litt. But a subsequent inspection has shewn me, that Cave merely intended by them to give the general meaning—and not the exact wording—of that Council. The following is the decree of the Synod, as given in the 16th vol. of Nic. Colet's edition of the Councils of Labbe and Cossart, with the additions of Baluzius and Harduin, Venice, 1731.

"Cum in nonnullis mundi partibus quidam temerarie asserere præsumant, populum Christianum debere sacrum Eucharistiæ sacramentum sub utraque panis et vini specie suscipere: et non solum sub specie panis, sed etiam sub specie vini populum laicum passim communicent, etiam post cœnam.....: hinc est, quod hoc præsens concilium sacrum generale Constantiense in Spiritu Sancto legitime congregatum, adversus hunc errorem saluti fidelium providere satagens, matura plurium doctorum tam divini quam humani juris deliberatione præhabita, declarat, decernit, et diffinit: Quod licet Christus post cœnam instituerit, et suis discipulis administraverit sub utraque specie panis et vini hoc venerabile sacramentum; tamen hoc non obstante, sacrorum canonum auctoritas laudabilis, et approbata consuetudo ecclesiæ servavit et servat, quod hujusmodi sacramentum non debet confici post cœnam, neque a fidelibus recipi non jejunis, nisi in casu infirmitatis, aut alterius necessitatis, a jure vel ecclesiæ concesso vel admisso. Et sicut hæc consuetudo ad evitan-

dum aliqua pericula et scandala est rationabiliter introducta, quod licet in primitiva ecclesia hujusmodi sacramentum reciperetur a fidelibus sub utraque specie, tamen postea a conficientibus sub utraque, et a laicis tantummodo sub specie panis suscipiatur; cum firmissime credendum sit, et nullatenus dubitandum, integrum Christi Corpus et Sanguinem tam sub specie panis, quam sub specie vini veraciter contineri. Unde cum hujusmodi consuetudo ab ecclesia et sanctis patribus rationabiliter introducta, et diutissime observata sit, habenda est pro lege, quam non licet reprobare, aut sine ecclesiæ auctoritate pro libito mutare. *Et cæt.* p. 218.